EURIPIDES'
KRESPHONTES AND ARCHELAOS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM OCTOGESIMUM SEPTIMUM

ANNETTE HARDER

EURIPIDES' KRESPHONTES AND ARCHELAOS

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM   E. J. BRILL   MCMLXXXV

EURIPIDES'
KRESPHONTES AND ARCHELAOS

Introduction, Text and Commentary

BY

ANNETTE HARDER

LEIDEN E. J. BRILL 1985

Printed with financial support of the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

ISBN 90 04 07511 9

Copyright 1985 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments . . . VII

Preface . . . IX

KRESPHONTES

Introduction

1. The play . . . 3
1.1 The date of the *Kresphontes* . . . 3
1.2 Later performances . . . 4
1.3 Trilogy? . . . 4
1.4 Relation with the *Cresphontes* of Ennius . . . 5
1.5 The *Kresphontes* in art . . . 7

2. Contents of the play . . . 7
2.1 Summary of contents; the myth . . . 7
2.2 *Dramatis personae*, chorus, scene . . . 12
2.3 Structure of the play . . . 14
2.4 Comparison with the Orestes-plays . . . 14
2.5 The *senex* . . . 17

3. The papyri . . . 18
3.1 *POxy*.27,2458 . . . 18
3.2 *PFayum* . . . 24

Text . . . 27

Commentary . . . 47

ARCHELAOS

Introduction

1. The play . . . 125
1.1 The date of the *Archelaos* . . . 125
1.2 The place of performance . . . 126
1.3 Later performances . . . 127
1.4 Trilogy? . . . 127
1.5 Special background of the play . . . 129

2. Contents of the play . . . 131
2.1 Summary of contents; the myth . . . 131

2.2 *Dramatis personae*, chorus, scene 138

3. The papyri . 139

3.1 *PHamb.*118 a . 139

3.2 *POxy.*3,419 . 143

Text . 145

Commentary . 169

Appendices:

1. Fragments and testimonia attributed to the *Kresphontes* . 275
2. Fragments and testimonia attributed to the *Archelaos* . 281

Bibliography . 291

Indexes:

1. Index of Passages discussed. 299
2. Index of Greek words. . . 300
3. Index of Names and Subjects . 301

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book was written as a doctoral dissertation and submitted to the Faculty of Arts at the University of Groningen, and I wish to express my gratitude to those who helped me during the process.

First of all I am very grateful to my supervisors, Prof. Dr. S. L. Radt and Prof. H. Lloyd-Jones. Prof. Radt's careful guidance and stimulating and intelligent criticism have been a very great help from the first tentative beginnings of the work until its completion. Prof. Lloyd-Jones always made time to discuss problems with me during my stay at Oxford and read through a draft of the book at a later stage, subjecting both my English and the book's contents to his robust and refreshing criticism. Thanks to the encouragement and interest of these two scholars the writing of this book has been an experience which was both very enjoyable and very instructive.

I also owe a great deal to Mr. P. J. Parsons and Dr. J. R. Rea, who taught me the secrets of papyrology and offered much helpful advice into the bargain.

Others also showed an interest at various stages of the work. I am indebted especially to Prof. Dr. D. Holwerda and Prof. Dr. B. Snell, who put their notes and ideas generously at my disposal, and to Mr. W. S. Barrett, who let me profit from his philological acumen during long discussions in Keble College. For help with the translation of Czech and Polish articles I must thank several friends at Oxford.

Favourable circumstances for working on this book were created by the "Philologisch Studiefonds" (Utrecht), which enabled me to spend a year at Oxford; by the "Netherlands Association for the Advancement of Pure Research" (Z.W.O.), which provided me with a job at the "Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos" and subsidized the publication of my book; and during the last few years by my colleagues at the University of Utrecht, who always left me ample time to work on my fragments.

Finally I owe very much to my parents, and also to my friends, especially to Bert, Foka, Jill, Anita and Betto. Their affectionate moral support has been — and still is — very valuable.

PREFACE

Except that both plays deal with stories about descendants of Herakles, the *Archelaos* and *Kresphontes* have little in common. They have been combined here mainly because of reasons which have nothing to do with their contents: in the first place we have fairly substantial papyrus-fragments of both, of which editions are available, but no exhaustive commentary (Musso's commentary on the *Kresphontes* I would not call exhaustive). Besides, there is also a number of book-fragments and testimonia, which proved to be even more in need of a modern commentary. A new study of both plays seemed therefore well justified.

The commentary on the fragments is mainly philological, because obviously with fragments there is little else one can do. In the introductions to the plays and in the commentary on the testimonia I have ventured some general remarks on plot, structure and background of the plays. Of course, much is hypothetical here, but on the other hand both the *Archelaos* and the *Kresphontes* must have been plays of considerable interest and it seemed worth the effort to try to make the most of our evidence. Especially tantalizing are such matters as the background of the *Archelaos*, written in honour of the Macedonian king (or was it?) and the relation of the *Kresphontes* with the plays about Orestes, in particular Euripides' own *Elektra*.

As to the text, I have re-read the papyri in Oxford, London and Hamburg and give my results in a transcript and a transcription-apparatus. But of course I owe very much to previous editors of the text, especially to Siegmann's edition of the *Archelaos*-papyrus in Hamburg (a papyrus which reminds one of 'penguins on a beach' according to a papyrologist with whom I once talked about it). As to the book-fragments and testimonia, I have relied on the text as given in the modern standard-editions of their sources, from which I have also taken over the information on the manuscript-readings in the apparatus and on Nauck's edition of 1889, especially for the older conjectures; in cases where I have not been able to trace them I insert them in my apparatus 'teste Nauck'. Emendations proposed after Nauck I have collected as far as possible and inserted into the apparatus selectively (e.g. the oddities of Walker I have left out almost without exception). The emendations proposed in the apparatus to the testimonia I have not traced.

For the fragments I have kept the numbering and order of Nauck and added the numbers in Austin; the papyrus-fragments I have inserted 'where they come in in the plays', which was fairly obvious in all cases, with their number in Austin and *editio princeps*; the testimonia I have numbered myself, as no numbering was available, starting for each play with those which refer

to outward features of the play and ending with those about the contents; doubtful testimonia I have indicated with * and testimonia which I consider to be falsely attributed I have relegated to the appendices.

To the fragments I have sometimes added indications of speakers, thereby adopting the following system:

X: attribution certain from source or text of fragment; beginning of speech
(X): idem, but not certain that speech starts here
X?: attribution is hypothetical; beginning of speech
(X?): idem, but not certain that speech starts here.

To the fragments and testimonia in the appendices I have generally added no apparatus: I briefly discuss their attribution, but consider the constitution of their text to be beyond the scope of this book.

In the indexes I have included those items and passages which are discussed at some length in introduction, commentary or appendices. For the abbreviations used see the note on the abbreviations preceding the bibliography.

As to the spelling of Greek names I found attempts at consistency extremely frustrating and have roughly followed the system that for well-known names like Aeschylus or Corinth I have kept the conventional spelling, whereas I have generally transliterated the names of characters from the plays and titles of plays (unless this resulted in a clash with the abbreviations in LSJ).

University of Utrecht
Summer 1983

Note on the transcription of the papyri

Because of the bad state of the papyri I have indicated with a dot only those letters which are badly damaged; a single dot indicates that a letter has not been read or not been read with certainty or is merely represented by an indefinite trace. In the latter case there naturally is no description in the apparatus. I generally refrained from describing traces of those letters which have been supplied with certainty for philological reasons, especially in *PHamb.* 118 a, which is in an extremely bad condition. Where the text is still uncertain I attempted a description of the traces, but in *PHamb.* 118 a found it often very difficult to distinguish which ink actually formed part of a letter and which did not; also the fact that often ink may have been broken away may have led me to false impressions.

I have inserted into the apparatus the readings of the *editio princeps* when I differ from them, and those of subsequent editors when they differ from the *editio princeps*; but I have not included those cases where the difference

concerns only the presence or absence of a dot below a letter. In the reading-text supplements are by the first editor, unless otherwise indicated in the apparatus.

To the transcript of *PHamb.* 118a col. I 1-14 I have added no remarks in the apparatus: it only means to record what I could 'read', knowing that the lines should contain the ends of *IT* 53-66—there was nothing, as far as I could see, to contradict this identification.

KRESPHONTES

INTRODUCTION

1. The play

1.1 The date of the *Kresphontes*

As to the date of the *Kresphontes*, we have no means of knowing the exact year in which the play was first performed, but we do possess some evidence which permits us to date the play roughly:

(1) fr. 453: the beginning of this ode to Peace was parodied in Ar. *Georgoi* fr. 109 (1, 419 Kock) and this play can be roughly dated as well; in *Georgoi* fr. 100 (1, 416f. Kock) there is a reference to Nicias' withdrawal from the generalship in relation to the campaign to Pylos in the summer of 425 (cf. Th. 4, 28; Plu. *Nic.* 8, 528a-c). This provides us with a *terminus post quem* for the *Georgoi*. Cf. Gomme on Th. 4,41 (p. 486): "Aristophanes very likely wrote *Georgoi* soon after the campaign of 425, but perhaps not very soon after; such a taunt against Nikias would live long". It may be added that a date after 421, when the peace became a fact seems unlikely in view of the contents of *Georgoi* fr. 109, which express a desire for peace. The current and quite plausible view is that the *Georgoi* were produced at the City Dionysia of 424; cf. E. Capps, *The date of Aristophanes' Georgoi*, AJPh 32, 1911, 421-30; P. Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*, Berlin 1925, 36; Schmid *GGL* I 4, 191; Di Benedetto 130f. (of the festivals 'available' shortly after 425 the Lenaea of 424 were occupied with the *Equites*, the Dionysia of 423 with *Nubes I*, and the *Holkades* are claimed for the Lenaea of 423; cf. Geissler o.c. 36f.; Schmid *GGL* I 4, 191 n. 11; C. F. Russo, *Aristofane autore di teatro*, Firenze 1962, 148 + n. 1).

The date of the *Georgoi* thus provides us with a *terminus ante quem* for the *Kresphontes*. However, the mere fact that the *Kresphontes* was parodied in the *Georgoi* does not imply that it was a recent play when the *Georgoi* were produced. Cf. Basedow 23; and, for the observation that the lapse of time between play and parody could be considerable, Bergk apud Meineke *FCGr* II 2, 959; A. C. Schlesinger, TAPhA 67, 1936, 312f. (who remarks that "comparatively few parodies from datable plays are from recent plays" and shows that the intervening time is most often five years or more).

A *terminus ante quem* of 424 is also suggested by Plb. 12, 26, 5 (= Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F*22), who tells us that the historian Timaeus recorded that Hermocrates quoted fr. 453, 1-7 in a speech at the peace congress in Gela in 424 (cf. Th. 4, 58-64). For what it is worth this fits in with the evidence from the *Georgoi*.

(2) fr. 449: if this is rightly regarded as a reminiscence of Hdt. 5, 4, 2, we can establish a *terminus post quem* for the *Kresphontes* as well. The general view is that Herodotus' work was published between 430-425/4 (cf. e.g. Jacoby *RE* Suppl. 2, 1913, 232; Schmid *GGL* I 2, 590f.; J. Cobet, Hermes 105, 1977, 2-27). On the relation between fr. 449 and Hdt. 5, 4, 2 see intr. to fr. 449.

(3) metre: as we have only 36 complete trimeters of the *Kresphontes* (including fr. 456, which is corrupt) I think it wiser to leave this criterion out of account. It may be noticed that before *POxy.* 27, 2458 was added to the fragments of the *Kresphontes* there was only one resolution (in a proper name [Νιόβης in fr. 455, 2]) in 19 trimeters, whereas now there are 7 in 36 trimeters, of which 3 occur in proper names and one in a supplement.

Combining (1) and (2) we can state with some confidence that the first performance of the *Kresphontes* must have been between 430 and 424. This fits in with the general view; cf. e.g. Schmid *GGL* I 3, 396 (between 429-425); Webster 137, Di Benedetto 131 (about 425); Goossens 306 n. 169 (end of 425 or 424); Austin 41 (before 424). Musso[1] 80-89 (and id.[6] XXVII f.) suggests the Dionysia of 423, but none of his arguments is cogent. The attempts of Howald 6; 54 ff. and J. A. Spranger, CQ 19, 1925, 127 f. who date the *Kresphontes* resp. after 415 and in 419 can, I think, be safely ignored.

1.2 Later performances

There are several indications that the *Kresphontes* was revived after its first performance, but not all of them are quite beyond dispute; cf. test. 1; 2 and 3. More substantial evidence is offered for early II A.D. by Plu. *De esu carnium* 2, 5, 998 e (quoted as context with fr. 456), a description of the scene in which Merope is about to attack Kresphontes with an axe which strongly suggests that Plutarch has watched this scene himself (cf. Lucas on Arist. *Po.* 1454 a 5; Pickard-Cambridge 274; *TrGF* 1 p. 21); and for II/III A.D. by *POxy.* 27, 2458 where the dramatic sigla suggest that it was an actor's copy (for details see intr. 3.1). Turner[3] 120-128 regards this papyrus as an indication that the *Kresphontes* was still performed in the theatre at Oxyrhynchus in II/III A.D., but of course the acting copy need not have come from the local theatre.

1.3 Trilogy?

Some attempts have been made to place the *Kresphontes* in a trilogy, but nothing can be proved or even defended on good grounds. Cf. e.g. Hartung 2, 21 f. (*HF – Temenidai – Kresphontes + Kerkyon*), Th. Bergk, Hermes 18, 1883, 506 n. 3 (perhaps with the *Erectheus*), Musso[1] 89 (*Kresphontes – Temenidai – Su.*; cf. id.[6] XXIX f.), Webster 137 (with *Andr.*). Wilamowitz's use of Amm. 28, 4, 27 (= app.1 C 2) to argue that there was a trilogy consisting of *Heracl. – Kresphontes – Temenos* is not convincing; for details see on app. 1 C 2.

1.4 Relation with the *Cresphontes* of Ennius

Whether or not the *Cresphontes* of Ennius was the Latin version of Euripides' *Kresphontes* is still a matter of dispute. The current view has long been that Ennius made a Latin adaptation of Euripides' play (cf. Jocelyn 271 + n. 4). So recently Mette[2] 68: "Auf jeden Fall spricht nichts gegen die Annahme, dass Ennius das Drama des Euripides den Römern zugänglich gemacht hat". But things are not as simple as that: it is very hard to see how fr. LIII Joc. would fit into the story of Euripides' *Kresphontes: iniuria abs te adficior indigna pater. / nam si inprobum esse Cresphontem existimas, / cur me huic locabas nuptiis? sin est probus, / cur talem inuitam inuitum cogis linquere? // nulla te indigna nata adficio iniuria. / si probus est, collocaui. sin est inprobus, / diuortio te liberabo incommodis.* Euripides' play seems to offer no room for a father who wants to take his daughter away from her husband. An ingenious, but unconvincing attempt to squeeze him in has been made by Welcker 2, 836 ff.: Kypselos, having heard that Polyphontes has put a price on the head of his grandson, comes to fetch Merope home; Merope, however, has just pretended to be reconciled to Polyphontes and can do nothing but refuse; this involves reading *Polyphontem* instead of *Cresphontem* in l. 2. Cf. also the attempts of Th. Bergk, RhM 35, 1880, 244 ff. and Calderini 566 f.; 568 ff., who compared fr. LIII to the '*Didot Papyrus*' (on which see below and app. 1 A) and attributed this papyrus to the *Kresphontes.*

Several other solutions of the problem have been tried:

(1) O. Ribbeck, *Die Römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*, Leipzig 1875 (rHildesheim 1968), 188 believed that because of fr. LIII Ennius' play must have dealt with the fate of Kresphontes Sr. This view was accepted by Jocelyn 270 ff.; Musso[6] XXXII f. If fr. LIII really belongs to Ennius' *Cresphontes*, this is quite a plausible solution. But the provenance of fr. LIII is not absolutely certain (see below).

(2) Vysoký 9-13 (German summary 19 f.) believed that Ennius' play was a contamination of two plays by Euripides: *Kresphontes I* (± 425) about Kresphontes Sr., in which play Merope is urged by her father Kypselos to leave her husband (fr. 453 and 1083 should belong to this play) and *Kresphontes II*, an anagnorisis-play of later date containing the story about Kresphontes Jr., which is preserved by test. 5. As to Euripides this theory —which is mere conjecture—cannot be called *a priori* inconceivable, but one wonders how all this stuff could be made into one coherent play by Ennius. Contamination (of E. *Kresph.* and a IVth century play) was also suggested by Gudeman on Arist. *Po.* 1454 a 5.

(3) A third solution, which I think is the most attractive, is to accept the idea that Ennius adapted Euripides' *Kresphontes* and leave fr. LIII out of consideration. First of all it should be noted that (a) the source of fr. LIII (Auct. ad Her. 2, 38) does not tell us where the fragment comes from, (b) in

l. 2 *Cresphontem*, on which the attribution of the fragment to Ennius' *Cresphontes* is based, is metrically odd: perhaps not fatally so (cf. Jocelyn ad loc.), but enough to justify some suspicion, (c) the other fragments could—if one wished to try—all be fitted into the story of Euripides' *Kresphontes* (for details see Jocelyn's commentary). Especially fr. LV *audi atque auditis hostimentum adiungito* would very well fit young Kresphontes asking for his reward (N. Wecklein, Phil. 39, 1880, 408 [cf. id. 4], uses this fragment to 'prove' that Ennius' play was an adaptation of Euripides'. Only fr. LVIII and fr. inc. CLXII might present problems, but they are not fatal; cf. Jocelyn 271 (besides, the appeal for peace in fr. inc. CLXII could be compared to fr. 453).

Wilamowitz[1] 154 n. 5 judged that fr. LIII was not from Ennius' *Cresphontes*, but that the author of the treatise ad Her. had used a comedy by Caecilius or some other poet and that one should read in l. 2 *Ctesiphontem* instead of *Cresphontem* (cf. Webster 138). Surely the subject with which this fragment deals is one well attested in comedy (though not, perhaps, exclusively comic; cf. Page *GLP* 1, 185): we find a father who wants to take a daughter away from her husband in Menander's *Epitrepontes* (cf. 655 ff.; 714 ff. + Gomme-Sandbach ad loc.) and in Plautus' *Stichus* (two daughters; cf. 15 ff. and Petersmann on 17) and in the '*Didot Papyrus*' (app. 1 A), to which some passages in the *Stichus* show a close similarity (cf. Petersmann intr. p. 25 f.). The similarity of fr. LIII to *PDidot* was also noticed by the editor of the papyrus (H. Weil, *Un papyrus inédit de la Bibliothèque de M. Ambroise Firmin-Didot*, Paris 1879, 14), who, however, regarded the trimeters as tragic and attributed them to Euripides' *Temenidai* (which play is supposed to deal with Hyrnetho, who is urged by her brothers to leave her husband Deiphontes) and fr. LIII to Ennius' adaptation of it, the name *Cresphontem* in l. 2 being merely an insignificant variation (Weil o.c. 12 ff.). Similarly N. Wecklein, Phil. 39, 1880, 406 ff. (reading *Deiphontem* instead of *Cresphontem* in 2) and F. Blass, RhM 35, 1880, 74-82.

However, Wilamowitz[2] 1, 42 n. 82 argued convincingly that *PDidot* cannot be by Euripides and the speech has now been declared to be the work of "ein zweit- oder eher drittklassiger Komödiendichter mit pseudotragischen Ambitionen" (Bühler 351; less devastating, but also offering a number of arguments against fifth-century tragedy A. W. Gomme - F. H. Sandbach, *Menander*, Oxford 1973, 723 f.). Considering all this I think that attributing fr. LIII to some unknown comedy is the solution that can be best defended [1].

[1] F. Marx, *Incerti auctoris ... ad C. Herennium libri IV*, Lipsiae 1894, 132; cf. also his edition of 1923, 58) suggests that fr. LIII is a translation of a rhetorical exercise based on the *Kresphontes*, its Greek source being probably an exercise of which *PDidot* formed part; and that therefore fr. LIII bears the same relation to Enn. *Cresph.* as *PDidot* to the *Kresphontes* of Euripides, i.e. that of a rhetorical exercise based on the play's contents. Surely both fragments are highly rhetorical (for *PDidot* cf. Bühler 348 f., who, however, in p. 351 n. 1 rejects the idea of an exercise; doubtful also Page

If this is right there would be nothing against regarding Ennius' play as an adaptation of the *Kresphontes* (for a similar line of thought cf. now P. Frassinetti, *Sul "Cresfonte" di Ennio*, CCC 2, 1981, 15-23). Yet, one should be careful in using the fragments of Ennius to reconstruct the *Kresphontes* (and *vice versa*), as Ennius may have used his source rather freely; cf. G. Herzog-Hauser, *Ennius imitateur d'Euripide*, Latomus 2, 1938, 225-232; Jocelyn 23 ff.

1.5 The *Kresphontes* in art

There are no certain representations of the *Kresphontes* on vases. Cf. the lists in T. B. L. Webster, *Monuments illustrating tragedy and satyrplay*[2] (BICS Suppl. 20), London 1967; A. D. Trendall-T. B. L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama*, London 1971; F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*, Marburg 1973[3]; cf. also F. Brommer-D. Kemp-Lindemann, *Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen Heldensage III*, Marburg 1976.

Attempts to attribute representations of a lady with an axe to the *Kresphontes* were made by Jahn 230 ff. (+ plate 66), cf. also Welcker 2, 835 n. 10; contra: C. Robert, *Archäologische Hermeneutik*, Berlin 1919, 213-4. We do not usually find these Heraclid myths on vase-paintings (cf. Robert[1] 178 and the lists mentioned above) and it seems more likely that the lady is Klytaimestra, whom we often find thus represented (see intr. 2.5). Cf. Musso[6] XXXI. The only certain representation of the *Kresphontes* in art was apparently the relief in the Apollonis-temple in Kyzikos (cf. test. 7), which is now lost.

2. Contents of the play

2.1 Summary of contents; the myth

(The following summary is only a loose paraphrase of test. 5 with occasional — unspecified — variations suggested by the other testimonia and the text of the fragments; it is given here in order that features of the play which are mentioned in the introduction shall be at once clear also to those who are not familiar with the play's contents).

Polyphontes, the king of Messenia, had killed the former king, his brother Kresphontes and taken over his kingdom and his wife Merope. Merope,

---

GLP 1, 184 f.). But Marx' theory does not help us to get rid of the father and daughter in either play, unless, perhaps, the exercises were based on a fact of the past which was briefly told in the prologue. Jocelyn 272 ff. rejected Marx' idea and insisted on the dramatic origin of fr. LIII.

however, had managed to hide her young son Kresphontes with her father in Arcadia and Polyphontes tried very hard to find him and offered a reward in gold if anyone should kill him. When the boy had grown up he decided to go and take revenge for the killing of his father and brothers. He therefore went to king Polyphontes to ask for the gold, telling him that he had killed the son of Kresphontes Sr. and Merope. The king then told him to wait in the guests' quarters, so that he could make inquiries about him first. When Kresphontes had fallen asleep, because he was tired, the old man who used to act as a messenger between Merope and her son came to Merope in tears, saying that young Kresphontes was no longer to be found with the person who had given him shelter. Merope, who believed that the young man asleep in the guests' quarters was the one who had killed her son, rushed into his room with an axe to kill him, without realizing that it was her own son. The old man, however, recognized him just in time and prevented the crime. Merope then saw an opportunity to take revenge on her enemy Polyphontes and pretended to be reconciled to him: the king was pleased and arranged a sacrifice, but then his guest Kresphontes, pretending that he was killing the victim killed the king and thus regained his father's kingdom.

When we read this summary of the *Kresphontes* we are immediately reminded of the story of Orestes as we find it in A. *Ch.*, S. *El.* and E. *El.*[2]: a king has been murdered by an enemy (Polyphontes/Aigisthos), his youngest child (Kresphontes/Orestes) has been smuggled away, grown up abroad and returns to take revenge on the murderer of his father, who has made himself king of the country. Also the additional elements like 'the relative at home, who is suffering, but still hoping' (Merope/Elektra) and 'the faithful old servant' (the *senex*; on whom see below intr. 2.5) are represented in the *Kresphontes*.

It is quite possible that Euripides borrowed some details from the Orestes-myth, although stories following this pattern may have been current about Messenia already before Euripides (see below and intr. 2.4). Cf. Robert[2] 2, 671: "An diese gänzlich unentwickelte Sage anknüpfend, hat Euripides eine seiner berühmtesten Tragödien, den Κρεcφόντηc, geschrieben, indem er beliebte dramatische Motive, vor allem aus den *Choephoren* des Aischylos' benutzte"; Wilamowitz[2] 1, 39, n. 75. We have no traces of this myth earlier than the *Kresphontes*[3], so this idea cannot be proved, but the proceedings

[2] On this myth in literature before Aeschylus cf. P. Bergmann, *Der Atridenmythos in Epos, Lyrik und Drama*, Diss. Erlangen/Nürnberg 1970.

[3] We have only an allusion to the tricks of Kresphontes Sr. in S. *Aj.* 1285 ff.; and Hdt. 6, 52, 1 Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ ὁμολογέοντες οὐδενὶ ποιητῇ λέγουσι αὐτὸν Ἀριστόδημον ... ἀγαγεῖν cφέας ἐς ταύτην τὴν χώρην is used by Basedow 11 to prove that Euripides got his subject "ex antiquis poetarum carminibus". That may be so, but we know almost nothing about these Heraclid poems (cf. also Stein on Hdt. 6, 52).

would be quite like Euripides (cf. also Schmid *GGL* I 3, 760). Also it is worth noticing that apart from Kresphontes Sr., who took no part in the play, none of the principal characters is found in independent sources (see comm. on test. 5, 1 and 3-5 on Polyphontes, Merope and young Kresphontes). This suggests that Euripides either used an otherwise unknown local myth or, according to the older view, that he invented them.

As to the unfamiliarity of Polyphontes we may have some indications in the play: (1) the insistence on his being a Heraclid in fr. 66, 16ff. A, which may well be because this relation of Kresphontes Sr. was not familiar to the audience, (2) his name, which looks suspiciously like a 'significant' name (on Euripides' play with names cf. e.g. Kannicht on *Hel.* 9-10; 13-15; Collard on *Su.* 496-7[a]) and, more important, may well be coined after the name Kresphontes. We often find that names of relatives, e.g. brothers and sisters, have one component in common; so e.g. Telemachus and Telegonus, the two sons of Odysseus; Iphinoe and Iphianassa (Hes. fr. 129, 24 + 131); Nausithoos and Nausinoos (Hes. *Th.* 1017f.); Eumelos (*Il.* 2, 764) and Perimele (Hes. fr. 256, 5) are recorded as children of Admetus; for more examples cf. E. Fraenkel, *RE* XVI 2, 1935, 1624f.; R. Hirzel, *Der Name*, Amsterdam 1962[2], 32f. So, if Euripides gave Kresphontes Sr. a brother (as he did according to Gell. *NA* 6, 3, 28; cf. fr. 451 + comm.), a name like Polyphontes would help to bring out the relationship. Such a proceeding could be paralleled from the *Helena* (cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 9-10, who shows that the name of Theoklymenos must be coined after that of his already 'existing' sister Eidothea/ Theonoe) and from *HF* where Euripides 'invented' the usurper Lykos and called him after his father (*HF* 31), and like Polyphontes introduced him elaborately in *HF* 26ff. and 38 (cf. Bond intr. XXVIII). The second argument may also be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to young Kresphontes (cf. comm. on test. 5, 3-5). Even so, it would be unduly positivistic to assume that Euripides *invented* these characters, simply because we do not find them elsewhere, and the play with names cannot really prove it. They may have existed in some version of the myth, with or without these names.

After Euripides we find the story of the killing of Kresphontes Sr. and its consequences in several prose-authors, who tend to leave out the 'dramatic' details of Euripides' version and adapt the story to suit propagandistic purposes in the conflict between Sparta and Messenia. Whether these versions

---

J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, Leiden 1960, 446f. finds it tempting to see in Hes. fr. 166 Αἴπυτος αὖ τέκετο Τληcήνορα Πειρίθοόν τε a reference to Aipytos, the son of Merope and Kresphontes; but the context rather suggests that the Aipytos mentioned here is the same as in *Il.* 2, 604 (= Aipytos [3] in Roscher). Besides, it has recently been argued that there is no evidence that the Heraclid myths were very old, but that they must be dated rather *after* the poet of the Hesiodic catalogues (cf. Prinz 312).

are based directly on the *Kresphontes* or on other versions of the myth is a matter which cannot be decided.

The relevant texts are:

(1) Isoc. 6, 22-23 Μεσσήνιοι δ' εἰς τοῦτ' ἀσεβείας ἦλθον, ὥστ' ἐπιβουλεύσαντες ἀπέκτειναν Κρεσφόντην τὸν οἰκιστὴν μὲν τῆς πόλεως, κύριον δὲ τῆς χώρας, ἔκγονον δ' Ἡρακλέους, αὐτῶν δ' ἡγεμόνα γεγενημένον. διαφυγόντες δ' οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ τοὺς κινδύνους ἱκέται κατέστησαν ταυτησὶ τῆς πόλεως (sc. Sparta), ἀξιοῦντες βοηθεῖν τῶι τεθνεῶτι καὶ τὴν χώραν διδόντες ἡμῖν. ἐπερόμενοι δὲ τὸν θεὸν κἀκείνου προστάξαντος δέχεσθαι ταῦτα καὶ τιμωρεῖν τοῖς ἠδικημένοις ἐκπολιορκήσαντες Μεσσηνίους οὕτως ἐκτήσασθε τὴν χώραν.

Cf. also 6, 31. This version of the story contains no 'dramatic' details and has only its bare outlines in common with the *Kresphontes*: murder of Kresphontes Sr. and revenging offspring. It is conceivable that some such story was already in existence before Euripides, but of course we cannot infer from this passage that the story was originally pro-Spartan: that may just as well have been a modification by Isocrates; cf. Nilsson[2] 76, who regards Isocrates' version as a typical example of the adaptation of myths to the purposes of political propaganda, "in this case to justify the Spartan occupation of Messenia"; similarly Parke-Wormell 1, 248 f.

(2) Pl. *Lg.* 692 b Οὐ γὰρ ἱκανῶς ἦσαν νομοθεσίας ἔμπειροι, sc. Temenos and Kresphontes: a remark which may reflect a detail of another version of the myth.

(3) Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 116: Kresphontes gave the Messenians and the Dorians equal rights, which resulted in a conflict with the latter: again the story is purely 'political' (Parke-Wormell 1, 248 f. suggest that Ephorus is here elaborating the version of his teacher Isocrates), with no details to remind us of the *Kresphontes* (but cf. [4]).

(4) Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 31, which was apparently based on Ephorus (cf. Jacoby *FGrH* II C p. 243): again there is a political conflict, but it is followed by an account of how the Dorians, after they have killed Kresphontes Sr., also want to kill his sons, who have gone with their mother to her father Kypselos. The Dorians go and ask Kypselos to send the sons back with them as their father wants them to come home for a sacrifice. Kypselos gives them the two eldest sons (who are subsequently killed during the journey), but keeps the youngest, Aipytos, who has just been born, and brings him up. In this story the saving of the youngest son by Kypselos reminds us of Euripides' play (cf. fr. 66, 28 ff. A and test. 6, 5 f.). On Aipytos' later development as an unsuccessful king see id. F 34.

(5) Paus. 4, 3, 6-8 shows elements from the 'political' versions mentioned above, but also several elements which recall the *Kresphontes*: Pausanias tells us how Kresphontes is married to Merope, the daughter of the Arcadian king

Kypselos, by whom he has several sons, the youngest being Aipytos. Because of his democratic tendencies Kresphontes and his elder sons are killed by the rich, but Aipytos, who is still a child, brought up with his grandfather, survives and when he is grown up he returns with the help of the Arcadians and the other Dorian kings. He takes revenge on the murderers and their helpers and becomes such a good king that his progeny are called Aipytids instead of Heraclids. Cf. also Paus. 8, 5, 6-7 and 29, 5.

Niese 8ff. argued that the version of the myth as we find it in these prose-authors had been developed by the time of Epaminondas (i.e. ± 370 B.C.), and that it ultimately all goes back to Euripides' play ("Zu zweit beruht die Darstellung des Isokrates wie des Ephoros und aller Nachfolger auf einem Drama des Euripides, dem *Kresphontes*" [p. 10]). I think, however, that we could just as well accept the idea of some unknown myth, which on one hand provided Euripides with the material for his play, and on the other hand was incorporated in the "Kontroversliteratur über Recht und Unrecht Messeniens" (Jacoby *FGrH* II C p. 66; cf. also Nilsson[2] 75ff. on the use which was made of the Kresphontes-myth in this type of literature), which at a certain stage may have got mingled with details from Euripides' play[4].

Here, of course, the question arises whether Euripides' play also reflected the discussion about Messenia. This question is hard to answer: all that can be said is that it seems not *a priori* impossible, as the subject was not without topicality in the years when the *Kresphontes* was written. A political undertone of the *Kresphontes* was favoured by E. Schwartz, Hermes 34, 1899, 449: "Umgekehrt benutzt und bekämpft er [sc. Euripides] mit seiner Erfindung die von Isokrates und Plato vertretene spartanische Version, nach welcher Kresphontes ermordet war und seine Söhne bei Sparta Schutz gesucht hatten, um den Preis ihres Landes; diese ist also älter als das 4. Jahrhundert und wird zur Zeit des Aufstandes von Ithome entstanden sein". Schwartz believed that the fate of the exiled young Kresphontes, who eventually returned to his country was inspired by the fate of the Messenians, who after the revolution of 464 had been settled in Naupaktos by the Athenians and had been in Pylos since 426. Similarly Bengl 16 n. 2 and 67; Goossens 281 + n. 174; Wilamowitz[2] 1,

[4] As to Arcadia as the place where Kresphontes found protection with his grandfather (cf. test. 6, 5f. and fr. 66, 30 with comm.), it may be worth noticing that a tradition existed that Messenian exiles at the end of the second Messenian war found shelter in Arcadia: our earliest evidence for this story is Kallisthenes *FGrH* 124 F 23, who also mentions the fact that the Arcadians gave their daughters in marriage to Messenians of the same age (cf. on this fragment F. Kiechle, *Messenische Studien*, Diss. Erlangen 1957, 4 and 16ff.). Elements from such stories about Messenia (which were probably older than Kallisthenes; cf. Jacoby ad loc.) *may* have been used and modified by Euripides for his story about Kresphontes (i.e. Arcadia as place of refuge, connection by marriage).

31 n. 55 (on the political impact of fr. 1083, which he takes to be from the *Kresphontes*; cf. also Nestle[1] 314).

2.2 *Dramatis personae*, chorus, scene

The evidence permits us to 'identify' six of the *dramatis personae*: 'γ̄', Kresphontes, Merope, Polyphontes, *senex* (the testimonia leave no doubt as to their taking part in the action of the play; cf. also the contexts of frs. 450, 451, 454, 456, 458 and fr. 66 A col. II + intr.) and a messenger, who must have told how Polyphontes was killed. We cannot be sure that these were *all* the *dramatis personae*, but as far as we have the means to judge the list looks fairly complete. In the preserved plays of Euripides the number of characters ranges from 7 (*IT*) to 11 (*Ph.*), the average being 8 or 9.

(1) γ̄, who tells Kresphontes all about the situation in the royal palace on his arrival in fr. 66, 13 ff. A; on the identity of γ̄ see the introduction to fr. 66 A col. II;

(2) young Kresphontes: for his role in the play cf. the testimonia (esp. test. 5). We find him speaking and praying in fr. 66 A and perhaps in fr. 450. Cf. also intr. 2.1 and comm. on test. 5, 3-5. In Greek literature we do not find him mentioned except in connection with Euripides' play (cf. Stoll in Roscher II 1, 1421 s.v. Kresphontes [2]);

(3) Merope: for her part in the play cf. the testimonia and the contexts of frs. 451, 454 and 456. Of the fragments frs. 451, 454, 456 and 458 can be attributed to Merope with certainty; fr. 455 with some probability, whereas she is also among the candidates for frs. 449, 457 and 459. Cf. also intr. 2.1 and comm. on test. 5, 1. The number of fragments that can be attributed to Merope and the testimonia suggest that her part in the play was quite important and the emotional impact of it considerable. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the modern plays which were based on the story of Kresphontes are called *Merope*; so e.g. the plays by P. Torelli (1589), S. Maffei (1713), Voltaire (1743), Matthew Arnold (1858) and D. Bernardakis (1866)[5];

(4) Polyphontes, whose part in the play and doings 'in the past' we can gather from test. 5; 6 and 7 and fr. 66, 13 ff. A, where he is the subject of the

---

[5] For a survey of later treatments of the Kresphontes-myth see H. Hunger, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Wien 1969[6], 253 f.; for a discussion of some of these plays *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon* 4, Zürich 1968, 2491-2496 (= 15, München 1974, 6241-43); some older discussions in Lessing nos. 37 ff.; Matthew Arnold, *Preface to Merope*, in Matthew Arnold, *On the Classical Tradition* (ed. R. H. Super), Ann Arbor 1960, 38 ff.; Canonica 31 ff. Elements from the *Kresphontes*-myth were also used by Goethe for his (unfinished) *Elpenor* and his (unwritten) *Iphigenie auf Delphos*, on which see e.g. H. Trevelyan, *Goethe and the Greeks* (Foreword by H. Lloyd-Jones), Cambridge 1981, XVI, 107 ff. and 135 ff.

conversation between Kresphontes and $\bar{\gamma}$. The only fragment which can be attributed to him is fr. 452 (where see comm.). Cf. also intr. 2.1 and comm. on test. 5, 1;

(5) the *senex*: for his part in the play cf. test. 5 and the context of fr. 456. There are no fragments which can be attributed to him with certainty, but see comm. on fr. 449 and 457 (on the impossibility of him being $\bar{\gamma}$ in fr. 66, 13 ff. A see intr. to fr. 66 A col. II). It cannot be inferred from our evidence that the *senex* helped Merope to plan the attack with the axe, as Wecklein 12 and Webster 141 thought (comparing the scene in *Ion* 970 ff.). In fact this attack looks 'spontaneous' rather than deliberately plotted; in this respect it is worth noticing that Merope used an *axe* as her weapon: an axe would be more likely to lay about somewhere than a sword or a spear; cf. A. *Ch.* 889 (Klyt.:) δοίη τις ἀνδροκμῆτα πέλεκυν ὡς τάχος; K. Latte, Hermes 66, 1931, 132 and Fraenkel A. *Ag.* Appendix B p. 807. Cf. on the *senex* also intr. 2.5;

(6) it is likely that the story of the killing of Polyphontes at the altar was told by a messenger, as in *El.* 774 ff. the killing of Aigisthos.

We have only two utterances of the chorus, one of which is badly mutilated (fr. 66, 70 ff. A from the parodos and fr. 453; cf. also comm. on fr. 449). Neither of them gives an indication of the chorus' sex. The only thing we can gather from fr. 453 is that the chorus was probably not yet old; cf. comm. on fr. 453, 4-5. Some have argued for a male, others for a female chorus. Of course no certainty can be reached, but if we are right in supposing that Merope's part in the play was important, it seems a plausible suggestion that the chorus was female so as to sympathize with her. Cf. Basedow 22, who remarks that if a woman has the leading part in a play Euripides usually gives her a female chorus to sympathize with her suffering; from the plays with male titles one could compare e.g. *Hipp.*, *Ion* and *Or.* Yet one should beware of generalizations: cf. the warning of Wilamowitz[2] 2, 115 f. n. 12. Basedow's idea was approved of by Wecklein 5 (cf. also N. Wecklein, JAW 13, 1878, 50), who adds on p. 7 that the chorus consisted of ladies from the town, not servants; but here I cannot understand his reasons.

A male chorus was favoured by e.g. Welcker 2, 831 (old Messenians), Wilamowitz[2] 2, 115 f. n. 12; Calderini 565 (Messenian citizens, because of fr. 453), Mette[1] 394 and Musso[4] 66 (Messenians siding with the dead king). But none of them offers substantial arguments. The only argument the text has seemed to offer is the address in fr. 66, 62 A; cf. Turner[1] ad loc.: "If ὑμεῖc is addressed to the chorus and μνηcθέν[τεc is part of the address, the chorus is male" (cf. also Musso[6] ad loc.). But as the line is probably *not* addressed to the chorus, the argument falls flat.

As to the scene of the play there can be little doubt that the action took place in front of the palace of Polyphontes in Messenia, as this accounts best for the story in test. 5. Cf. also fr. 66, 13 A μ̣[ῶν ἄδικο]c̣ οἴκων δε[c]πότηc

περὶ ξένους; and 20, both obviously referring to the house in front of which the speakers are standing.

2.3 Structure of the play

Thanks to the summary in test. 5 we are able to form an opinion on the structure of the play. It is clear that it was built around the sequence 'return-recognition-mechanema', and as such it already foreshadows the much later plays of this type (*El.*, *IT*, *Hel.*; cf. also *Ion*). It has been argued that, on the other hand, the violent attack of Merope recalls the revenges of women like Medea, Phaidra and Hekabe (cf. Matthiessen[1] 113, who calls attention to the 'bridge-function' of the *Kresphontes*). As far as we have the means to judge this sounds quite plausible. On the 'anagnorisis-mechanema plays' cf. e.g. Howald 56ff.; F. Solmsen, Phil. 87, 1932, 1-17; id., Hermes 69, 1934, 390-419; Matthiessen[1] 93ff.; especially on anagnorisis Schwinge 236ff. (lit. on p. 236 n. 90); on the use that Euripidean characters make of 'truth' and 'deceit' S. Jaekel, Arctos 11, 1977, 15-40; on the episodic structure of these plays also Aichele in Jens 77f.

2.4 Comparison with the Orestes-plays

If we compare the story of Kresphontes with that of Orestes it is at once apparent that both belong to the same category of myths (for some other examples of myths thus belonging to the same category see W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1979, 5ff. in a chapter on Vladimir Propp's theory). When studying the tragic treatments of the myths of Orestes and Kresphontes, it is therefore important to bear in mind that what looks like imitation may be merely a fixed element in this kind of story. On the other hand it is very likely that a tragic poet, when dealing with a theme that had been treated already by his predecessors or by himself, was influenced by these treatments of the story. He may have imitated certain features, or elaborated on them, or chosen to leave them out. After all, writing a tragedy was a conscious artistic effort, in which the poet gave his own interpretation of the traditional story. The following analysis, in which I owe much to the discussions of T. von Wilamowitz and Matthiessen[1], is based on this assumption. On the Kresphontes-myth in general see intr. 2.1.

(1) The recognition between the returning son and the faithful relative at home, though a recurrent motif in this kind of stories, is treated differently in the four plays which concern us here (A. *Ch.*, E. *Kresph.*, S. *El.* and E. *El.* [cf. Schwinge 237f. n. 93]). In A. *Ch.* the recognition comes early in the play and is clearly subordinate to the revenge; cf. Matthiessen[1] 113: "Der Vollzug der Rache, in den "Choephoren" die eigentliche Handlung, wird an den Rand

gedrängt (sc. in the *Kresphontes*), während die zweite Handlung mit der Szenenfolge "Trauer über den Tod des Sohnes — Planszene — Mordszene — Erkennungsszene" in den Mittelpunkt rückt. Diese zweite Handlung aber ist der Prägestempel, der das Stück als ein Werk des Euripides ausweist". This is, I think, basically right, except that (a) we have no evidence of a "Planszene" (see intr. 2.5), (b) the inference from A. *Ch.* that in the *Kresphontes* too there was only a short scene of joy after the recognition (112 n. 5) is not justified, especially if the recognition-scene was so much more important in the *Kresphontes*. In S. *El.* the recognition-scene is very elaborate and may be said to be the climax of the play (cf. Matthiessen[1] 114). In E. *El.* the recognition is long and laborious, but without the impact and importance of the scene in Sophocles. As to the *Kresphontes*, we do not know many details, but our evidence certainly suggests that it was well prepared and of considerable emotional impact (see on fr. 456).

(2) Kresphontes' announcement of his own death is again a traditional motif, but differently treated by the three tragedians. In A. *Ch.* 674 ff. it is quickly and successfully applied, but like the recognition it is entirely subordinate to the action of the revenge. Both Sophocles and Euripides in his *Kresphontes* develop this motif into an important feature of their plays. S. *El.* contains two messages of the death of Orestes, coming from different quarters so as to be more convincing; cf. Jebb intr. S. *El.* XXXIX, who regards the double message as an improvement on the simple story in A. *Ch.* First the old man tells the story, pretending to be a messenger from Phanoteus (660 ff.; cf. also 44 f. and Jebb and Kaibel ad loc.); then the story is confirmed by Orestes and Pylades, who come as Phocians, sent by Strophios, to bring the ashes (1098 ff.). All this has already been planned in the prologue. In the *Kresphontes* we have a double announcement of the hero's death too, but the evidence suggests that it was there presented as an unhappy coincidence, whereas other details are different too: (a) Kresphontes not only announces his own death, but introduces himself as his own murderer (cf. Matthiessen[1] 112, Schwinge 301 f.), (b) the trick, though successful in the end, almost becomes fatal when Merope believes the story and acts accordingly, (c) the announcement is 'accidentally' confirmed by the story of the *senex*, who arrives with the message that Kresphontes has disappeared. In his *Elektra* Euripides did not use this motif, but we find it again in *IT* and *Hel.*[6]

(3) In both S. *El.* and the *Kresphontes* the reactions of the woman at home are violent: like Merope Elektra decides to take revenge herself after she has heard the old man's story (S. *El.* 947 ff.); cf. T. von Wilamowitz 252 f.: "Die

---

[6] It has been argued that this was to avoid similarity with the *Elektra* of Sophocles, which, in that case, must have been the earlier play of the two. Cf. T. von Wilamowitz 255 f., Schwinge 301 f.

Übereinstimmung der hier erreichten Situation mit der in der zweiten Chrysothemisszene bei Sophokles ist frappant und beruht schwerlich auf Zufall; aber wie natürlich wird die Wirkung der falschen Todesnachricht im *Kresphontes* erreicht gegenüber dem künstlichen Mittel der Voraussendung des Pädagogen bei Sophokles und der sachlich so unmotivierten langen Lügenerzählung" (cf. also p. 263).

(4) The tyrant's attitude is rather different in the various plays: in A. *Ch.* 838 ff. Aigisthos enters the palace straightaway, curious to hear about the death of Orestes and not suspecting any danger. In E. *El.* 774 ff. we are told how Aigisthos was killed by Orestes at the sacrifice to which he had invited him, as was calculated by the old man (637). It seems surprising, even if it was customary to invite passing strangers to a sacrifice, that Aigisthos was not a little more suspicious (cf. Bergmann 143 f.). It looks as if the invitation was better motivated in the *Kresphontes*, where Kresphontes passed as the murderer of Kresphontes and his story had been 'confirmed' by the reports of the *senex*; besides, it is likely that Merope, in the mock-reconciliation, had skilfully led Polyphontes to a feeling that all was well now (as Medea did with Jason in *Med.* 869 ff.); cf. also T. von Wilamowitz 254 + n. 1; Webster 137 f. For the detail that both Aigisthos and Polyphontes were killed from behind see test. 7, 8 + comm.

(5) On the motif of the faithful servant in these plays see intr. 2.5. In both the *El.* and the *Kresphontes* Euripides uses him to bring about the recognition (*El.* 487 ff.)[7]; cf. T. von Wilamowitz 254; Brandt 9 + n. 14.

Some motives which are made use of in one play and merely mentioned in another are:

(6) the reward offered to the man who kills Orestes/Kresphontes: in E. *El.* 32 f. Aigisthos, like Polyphontes, offers such a reward. But whereas in the *Kresphontes* this reward provides Kresphontes with a means of starting off the intrigue, no further use is made of it in the *El.*; cf. T. von Wilamowitz 254. Differently Wilamowitz[4] 6, 171 + n. 2 (= Hermes 18, 1883, 224 + n. 3), who suggests a function for this reward in *El.* and regards Stesichorus as the source of this motif;

(7) the implication in S. *El.* 169 f. and 317 ff. that during Orestes' absence messages passed between him and Elektra, which, however, is not of importance for the action of the play as it is in the *Kresphontes*; cf. T. von Wilamowitz 253 n. 1.

Although the state of our knowledge does not allow very firm conclusions, I think we may infer from this list that S. *El.* and the *Kresphontes* had a good

---

[7] For the motif of recognition with the help of a third party cf. also the attempts of Eurykleia in *Od.* (Matthiessen 113 f.); Euripides used this motif again in the *Alexandros*; cf. Coles[2] 27 f. and lines 30 ff. of the hypothesis.

deal in common as regards their treatment of the traditional elements of the myth. Both give prominence to the emotional implications of separation and recognition, whereas Aeschylus treats these elements as subordinate to the ultimate and all-important revenge. The idea that this shift of attention in the *Kresphontes* influenced S. *El.* is attractive (so T. von Wilamowitz 253).

2.5 The *senex*

If we look at the literary versions of the Orestes-myth before the *Kresphontes*, we come across faithful servants there too. Often they are a nurse: (1) there was a nurse called Laodameia in Stesichorus' *Oresteia* (cf. fr. 41 Page) and in Pherecydes, where she is said to have rescued Orestes (*FGrH* 3 F 134; cf. Jacoby ad loc., Bergmann 62), (2) in Pi. *P.* 11, 17 a nurse called Arsinoë saved Orestes, (3) in A. *Ch.* 734 ff. the old nurse of Orestes laments his presumed death. Elsewhere we find Talthybios in a similar role: Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 25 tells us that he brought Orestes to Strophios, and perhaps this derives from Hellanicus (cf. Robert[1] 165 and Jacoby ad loc.). Matthiessen[1] 113 argued that perhaps in the *Nostoi* Talthybios helped with the recognition (cf. 108 + n. 1), but we have no certain evidence for that.

In figurative art a male helper of Orestes is well attested in vase-paintings of the killing of Aigisthos (a popular theme on red-figure vases from ± 500 B.C. till shortly before the middle of the century): in this type of paintings we find Orestes killing Aigisthos, whereas Klytaimestra sways an axe in order to attack Orestes in her turn and a helper of Orestes tries to restrain her. This helper can often be identified as Talthybios, and sometimes as Pylades or a female figure (nurse, Elektra?). An echo of this scene has been detected in A. *Ch.* 889 where Klytaimestra calls for an axe to defend herself. For a discussion of the relevant vases cf. E. Vermeule, *The Boston Oresteia Krater*, AJA 70, 1966, 1-22 (Plates 1-8), esp. on her nrs. 6, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 25 (p. 14 ff.; lit. and further references in the notes); also Robert[1] 149 ff. (I have not been able to see A. J. N. W. Prag, *The Oresteia. Iconographic and Narrative Tradition*, 1983).

Although the details are different, this reminds one of the scene in the *Kresphontes*, where our *senex* is holding back Merope when she is about to attack Kresphontes: it seems quite possible that Euripides got this idea from the Klytaimestra-scene (so Ahlers 57). It has been argued that a painted scene like this would derive from a literary source, and that this source may have been the *Oresteia* of Stesichorus; cf. Vermeule o.c., 6, who after arguing that the axe-scene must be "primarily a literary invention" states: "Probably Stesichoros introduced it, for his lost *Oresteia* is contemporary with the first appearance of the axe in art", i.e. a metope from the Heraion in Foce del Sele, dated ca. 540 B.C., where a female figure seems to try and stop Klytaimestra with the axe (references in Vermeule o.c. 14 n. 40), but this

interpretation is not beyond doubt (cf. E. G. Pemberton, AJA 70, 1966, 377); Stesichorus as source was also favoured by Robert 149-191 (cf. Jebb intr. S. *El.* XV ff.). U. von Wilamowitz, *Aischylos. Orestie II*, Berlin 1896, 25 claimed the scene for his hypothetical[8] *Delphic Oresteia* (cf. 246 ff.). *If* the scene derives from Stesichorus, the axe-scene in the *Kresphontes* would contain another example of Euripides being influenced by this poet, but we cannot be certain[9], as the element could have been part of the story already before Stesichorus. On an archaic relief from Melos we find Elektra with a nurse and three men near the tombstone of Agamemnon (cf. P. Jacobsthal, *Die Melischen Reliefs*, Berlin 1931, 12-16 [plate 53]). Robert[1] 167 ff. argued that one of the men was Talthybios leading the recognition, but Jacobsthal (o.c. 16) would rather regard him as Pylades (who is also elsewhere found with a herald's hat and staff); for other arguments against Robert cf. Bergmann 69 ff.

The evidence mentioned above, especially the vase-paintings, makes it certain that the figure of the helpful male servant was a traditional element in (a version of) the Orestes-myth long before Sophocles and Euripides wrote their *Elektra's*, in which there is an old man who sides with Orestes and has helped him to escape (E. *El.* 16 ff., 285 ff.; S. *El.* 11 ff.) and in E. *El.* helps to bring about the recognition (285, 487 ff.); cf. on these old men Ahlers 52 ff.; Brandt 93 ff. Therefore Robert[1] may well have been right when he remarked: "Der παιδαγωγόϲ des einen, der πρέϲβυϲ des anderen sind augenscheinlich die Weiterbildungen des in einer früheren poetischen Behandlung vorkommenden Talthybios" (165). Cf. also Bergmann 104. It looks, however, as if the development of this character had already taken place in the *Kresphontes*, and it may well be that for both Sophocles and Euripides the *immediate* example for the role of the old man in their *Elektra's* was the *senex* in the *Kresphontes*.

3. The papyri

Two papyri with fragments of the *Kresphontes* have so far been found:

3.1 *POxy.* 27, 2458

Editions:

Ed. princeps by E. G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 27, London 1962, 73-81 (plate VIII).

---

[8] Cf. Bergmann 78 + n. 211 (lit.).

[9] On the influence of Stesichorus on Euripides and on tragedy in general see Kannicht, intr. *Hel.* p. 24 ff. (on p. 25 he mentions some motives from Stesichorus' *Oresteia* in Aeschylus and Euripides); A. J. Podlecki, Athenaeum 49, 1971, 318 ff.; some general remarks also in Stephanopoulos 18.

C. Austin, *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta*, Berlin 1968, 42-45.
O. Musso, *Euripide Cresfonte*, Milano 1974, 8-13 (not based on personal inspection of the papyrus).

Text of part of the papyrus, based on photograph:
H. Lloyd-Jones, Gnomon 35, 1963, 444-445 (fr. 1 col. II and III).
H. J. Mette, Hermes 92, 1964, 392-394 (fr. I, 2 and 3).
O. Musso, Aegyptus 45, 1965, 151-156 (fr. 1 col. III; fr. 2 col. I).
Z. K. Vysoký, Strahovská Knihovna 5-6, 1970-71, 14-16 (fr. 1 col. III; fr. 2).

Descriptions: Turner[1] 74; Donovan 76f.
The papyrus is now in the British Library in London (inv. nr. 3041).

There can be no doubt about the identification of the papyrus. Turner[1] 73 argued convincingly that the fragments must be from Euripides' *Kresphontes*. Although the overlappings with known quotations which were suggested by Turner[1] in fr. 1 col. III 9-10[10] (with fr. 456) and by Mette[1] in fr. 2 col. I 2 (with fr. inc. 1060) are respectively very unlikely and possible, but far from cogent (see comm. on fr. 66, 40 and 56f. A), there are other reasons why the identification can be regarded as certain:

(1) the contents of fr. 1 col. II exactly fit the story of Kresphontes as it is told by Hyginus and Apollodorus (test. 5 and 6);

(2) we know of no other Greek tragic poet who has dealt with this story;

(3) there are several elements in the text which can be considered as Euripidean: (a) the pattern of fr. 1 col. II 6-8 (see comm. on fr. 66, 18 A), (b) perhaps the expression γυναικὸϲ ἄζυγα in fr. 1 col. II 11 (but of course one must be very careful with this kind of argument; for details see comm. on fr. 66, 23 A), (c) the fragments can easily be fitted into a Euripidean type of prologue (see intr. to fr. 66 A) (Cengarle 67 also mentions the meaning of θηλή in fr. 1 col. II 16 as an argument: "il significato di *capezzolo* che ha qui θηλή è attestato, oltre che in Aristotele, solo in *Cycl.* 56", but this may be due to accident).

The writing in the papyrus, which is on the recto along the fibres, was described by Turner[1] 74 as: "an example of the common square, slightly sloping style. The letters are of a fair size, except for the tiny ο; ε and c usually have narrow, compressed shapes, but sometimes their horizontals are considerably extended; υ, ι and φ reach considerably below the line". There is no external evidence for the dating of the papyrus (the verso is blank, nor are there any other indications), but it was assigned by Turner[1] 74 "to the third century rather than the second, probably about its middle". This date is supported by some examples of similar hands which can be dated with some certainty: *POxy.* 1, 23 (Pl. *Lg.*; the text on the verso gives 295 A.D. as a *terminus ante quem*); 2, 223 (Hom. *Il.*; written on the verso of a petition dated

[10] In the description of the papyrus I have numbered the lines in each column separately, as in the transcript.

about 186 A.D.); 2, 232 (D. *Tim.*; dated II-III A.D. because of the cursive writing on the verso). Cf. also Donovan 77. The scribe sometimes adds rough breathings, acute, grave and circumflex accents. His use of the circumflex is sometimes peculiar and not, as far as I can see, recorded by Laum. Cf. fr. 1 col. II 15, 16 and 17, where he writes participles in -ων perispomenon; col. III 10; fr. 2 col. I 4. Apart from these aberrations his accents are in accordance with the Alexandrine system as it is described by Laum. Sometimes the scribe writes diaeresis over initial υ or ι. In fr. 2 col. I 8 there is a (mistaken) longmark. Diastole is used twice in composita (fr. 1 col. II 5 and 15; cf. Turner[7] 13 n. 2), after οὐκ in fr. 1 col. II 12 and several times to mark elision. Elision without diastole is found in fr. 1 col. I 1 (probably); II 14; scriptio plena, with or without diastole is used several times. At the only place where the scribe could have written ι-adscript it has been omitted (fr. 1 col. II 10). Punctuation is sometimes indicated by a high stop. The text contains several corrections written between the lines by the original hand, and a few by a thinner pen, which may indicate a second hand (fr. 1 col. II 14; III 10); once a word is deleted by superposed dots (fr. 1 col. III 16). In fr. 2 col. I 7 a supralinear correction is deleted again by strokes.

The papyrus consists of six fragments, of which fr. 1 is the largest (20.5 × 12 cms). This fragment contains the upper part of three consecutive columns. Of col. I only the ends of twelve lines are preserved; col. II contains 19 lines of stichomythia, divided over two characters marked ᾱ and γ̄ (on these sigla see below); col. III contains the beginnings of another 20 lines. Fr. 2 (7.4 × 8.1 cms) contains the bottom of two columns, col. I preserving the ends of nine lines, col. II the beginnings of eleven lines, nine of which are written in indentation and preceded by the siglum $\overset{o}{\chi}$. Actually fr. 2 consists of two separate pieces of papyrus, but the fibres are clearly continuous, so that the columns can safely be regarded as consecutive. Fr. 3 (4.2 × 4.3 cms) contains the remains of seven lines from the middle of a column and was convincingly placed below fr. 1 col. II by W. S. Barrett (see below). Frs. 4-6 are small scraps from the middle of columns, and I can see no way of determining their position (the physical appearance of the papyrus offers no help and fr. 6 is now lost).

The actual order in which the fragments must be placed is not quite certain. Cf. Turner[1] 75: "Frr. 2 to 6 cannot be placed with certainty in relation to fr. 1. There are no actual joins. They may well come from positions lower down the column in relation to fr. 1. If so, only the vertical fibres of the verso would be of use for placing, and these are indecisive" and 80: "As at present reconstituted it seems impossible that its [sc. fr. 2] col. I should be the lower part of fr. 1 col. II, since the intercolumnar space is insufficient. But a blank piece of papyrus to fill the gap might have gone missing". And indeed, in the glass in the British Library (cf. also plate VIII) fr. 2 has been reconstructed in

such a way that the intercolumnar space is much smaller than between fr. 1 col. II and III. This reconstruction, however, does not seem to be right, because we really want more room between the columns: in fr. 2 col. II 1 and 2 there are remains of a letter before cυ and εc, which implies that with this reconstruction the columns would almost touch each other (this argument becomes even more cogent if I am right in supposing that the metrical position of fr. 2 col. II 2 must be ×] ̣εc· or × –⏑] ̣εc·; see comm. on fr. 66, 69 A). Also this makes it obvious that something must have gone lost between col. I and II, and there are no reasons why this 'something' cannot have been of the same width as the intercolumnar space in fr. 1. We can therefore no longer reject the possibility that fr. 2 col. I and II followed fr. 1 col. II and III.

This order was adopted by Mette, Austin and Musso. It was rejected by Cengarle 70f. and Burnett 19f. because of the fragment's contents: both believe that in fr. 2 col. I Polyphontes is on stage, but their arguments are not convincing; see comm. on fr. 66, 40, 45 and 46 A. For a possible objection to Mette's order see comm. on fr. 66, 68ff. A.

As to fr. 3 Turner[1] 81 considered location below fr. 1 col. II as well as below fr. 1 col. III as a possibility, but did not believe that this exhausted the possibilities. He rejected the identification of fr. 3, 4 with fr. 1 col. III 19: "The evidence of the fibres is indecisive, but l. 72 comes too high in relation to l. 48, and before -vovτoc the traces seem to be α rather than ε". The fragment has now been placed below fr. 1 col. II by Barrett apud Austin 43 because of the idiom of fr. 3, 3, which strongly suggests that the fragment is from a stichomythia (see comm. on fr. 66, 34 A). If the stichomythia of fr. 1 col. II is continued in fr. 3, the number of lines lost between both fragments must be odd (fr. 3, 3 in that case being a question by ᾶ), so at least 1 line, but perhaps more. Identification of fr. 3, 1 with fr. 1 col. II 19 seems physically impossible: there is no way of bringing fr. 3, 1 × –⏑] ̣αιcọδẹ[(for the metrical position see comm. on fr. 66, 35 A) in alignment with fr. 1 col. II 19 unless one would cut off bits of papyrus at the top of fr. 3. On the other hand, if the location of fr. 2 col. I below fr. 1 col. II is right and the column-height was about 38 lines (Turner[1] 74; see below), not too many lines can be lost.

We can have no certainty as to the height of the columns and the number of lines they contained. Fr. 1 col. II, which is 12 cms high, contains 19 lines of text and part of the upper margin (1 cm. at its greatest reach); fr. 2 col. II, which is 8.1 cms high, contains 11 lines of writing and about 2 cms of the lower margin. Fr. 3 is 4.3 cms high and contains 7 lines. If the placing of fr. 3 below fr. 1 col. II is right (as I think it may well be), we may infer that the columns were at least 12 + 4.3 + 2 (lower margin) = 18.3 cms high and contained at least 19 + 1 (the minimum number of lines lost in between) + 7 = 27 lines of writing. If fr. 2 col. I should be placed below fr. 1 col. II + fr. 3, the column would be at least 16.3 + 8 (the height of fr. 2 col. I) = 24.3 cms

high, containing at least 27 + 1 (minimum number of lines lost between fr. 1 + 3 and fr. 2) + 9 = 37 lines. This would fit in with Turner[1]'s guess: "The 19 lines of col. II occupy about 12 cms., including a small top margin. If the roll were twice this size, which is a quite likely format, there would have been 38 or more lines in each column" (p. 74). On the number of lines in a column cf. F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford 1951[2], 57 ff.

Yet, all this only offers a very rough indication of what we may expect. Kenyon o.c. 59 observed that "the normal figures may be anything between 25 and 45 lines to a column" and certainly exceptions did occur (like e.g. *POxy.* 6, 852 [E. *Hyps.*, II-III AD], which is 37.1 cms high and has 54-62 lines to a column). Besides, the number of lines in the individual columns may vary (cf. Schubart 62; examples on p. 178). So, the column may well have contained more than 37 lines; but hardly less, I think, because there is still much to tell after fr. 1 col. II 19 and before col. III 1.

A special feature of this papyrus is the way in which in fr. 1 col. II and III 5 the speakers are indicated by the dramatic sigla ᾱ (= Kresphontes) and γ̄ (= his informer), apparently written by the original hand. Apart from these sigla change of speaker is also indicated by paragraphoi, whereas in fr. 2 col. II 3 the lyrical passage is written in indentation and preceded by $\overset{o}{\chi}$ (there may have been a paragraphos in the lost part of the papyrus, but perhaps it was not felt to be necessary because of the indentation; cf. Lowe 32 n. 21).

Attempts have been made to explain ᾱ and γ̄ as abbreviations of proper names, i.e. Aipytos and γέρων (Lloyd-Jones[1] 445 f.; Austin 42), but this must be rejected (as Austin too has later admitted: cf. C. Austin, *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, Berlin/New York 1973, 277 [note on fr. 255]), because (1) abbreviations of proper names would not have consisted of a single letter with a stroke over it, but rather of a few letters, and they would not have preceded each line (cf. e.g. *POxy.* 6, 852 [E. *Hyps.*, II-III AD]), (2) it is unlikely that Kresphontes was called Aipytos in this play and virtually impossible that his interlocutor was the *senex* who later recognized him.

It has been argued convincingly that these sigla are numbers by Andrieu 230-257, Lowe 27-42, Jory 65-78 (cf. e.g. *PBerol.* 13876, which has the sigla ᾱ γ̄ ς̄ ζ̄ η̄; *POxy.* 3, 413, which has Α Β Γ Δ ς: the presence of the symbol ς, which in papyri always is a figure, shows that the other letters are numbers as well); and they are ordinal numbers rather than cardinals because of the superposed strokes, which recall the practice in documentary papyri (cf. Turner[1] 76, Jory 65). So far these sigla have not been found in tragic texts, but they do occur in papyri of New Comedy (*PSI* 10, 1176 [I A.D.] and perhaps *PHib.* 2, 180 [III B.C.], but cf. Jory 65 f.) and mime (*POxy.* 3, 413 [II A.D.], *PVars.* 2 [II A.D.], *PBerol.* 13876 = G. Manteuffel, *De Opusculis*

Graecis..., Warszawa 1930, no. 16 [II A.D.], *PLitLond.* 97 [II A.D.]) and in manuscripts of Plautus and Terence (especially the *Codex Bembinus* [*Vat. Lat.* 3226]). In *POxy.* 36, 2746 (trag., I-II A.D.) there is a $\bar{\beta}$ below the beginning of line 14 in a different hand and R. A. Coles, who edited the papyrus, refers in his commentary ad loc. to Turner's introduction to *POxy.* 27, 2458. Yet it seems unlikely that this $\bar{\beta}$ is an algebraic siglum, as it precedes ὠιδή, which is not otherwise preceded by a siglum (on ὠιδή see Coles on line 3) and the normal practice in this papyrus is to indicate the speakers by abbreviated names.

The evidence of Plautus and Terence shows that there the sigla were not meant to indicate the characters in the play, but rather the actors, because (1) in the *Bembinus* the number of sigla is much less than the number of characters in the play (Andrieu 252 gives examples; cf. also Jory 75), (2) the sigla do not correspond to the first letters of the names (cf. Andrieu 250; an example from a papyrus is *POxy.* 3, 413, where A stands for Charition). Also it is clear in the Latin manuscripts that the numbers do not indicate the order in which the characters appeared on the stage (cf. Jory 75), and this leaves as the most plausible suggestion that the actors were numbered according to their rank (Andrieu 255f., Jory 75). The papyrus-fragments are of course too small to enable us to tell whether they follow the same system entirely, but it seems likely that there was a continuous tradition (the earliest evidence being *PSI* 10, 1176, though there the use of the sigla seems somewhat confused; cf. Jory 66; that the sigla indicate numbering of the actors by their rank in the mime-fragments has been argued convincingly by H. Wiemken, *Der griechische Mimus*, Bremen 1972, 173ff.; cf. id. in G. A. Seeck, *Das griechische Drama*, Darmstadt 1979, 425ff.).

The *Kresphontes*-papyrus really rather favours the idea that the numbers indicated the rank of the actor: if they indicated the order of appearance on the stage it would be very hard to find a suitable position for $\bar{\beta}$ (cf. Mette[1] 394): the fragments strongly suggest that we are in the prologue of the play and I cannot see how $\bar{\beta}$ could have entered between $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\gamma}$. If, however, $\bar{\alpha}$ = the protagonist and $\bar{\gamma}$ = the tritagonist, all is well (so also Cengarle 66). Musso objected to this idea and suggested that the sigla indicate the three main actors ($\bar{\alpha}$ = Kresphontes, $\bar{\beta}$ = Polyphontes, $\bar{\gamma}$ = Merope) according to the order in which they entered the stage; this being fixed, the secondary roles were divided among the actors as it was required by technical necessity (Musso[6] 29f.; cf. also Musso[3] 153 n. 3). This idea, however, is not favoured by the evidence of the Latin manuscripts and Musso apparently invented this complicated theory in order to bring the evidence of the papyrus in accordance with test. 1, where it is said that Aeschines, who is elsewhere referred to as a tritagonist, played Kresphontes, Kreon and Oinomaos (but see comm. on test. 1).

It seems likely that the algebraic sigla were especially used for acting copies of the plays and mimes; cf. Andrieu 248 f., who points out that the system would be inconvenient for readers. This theory is supported by the fact that we find the sigla in combination with musical and stage-directions in *PBerol.* 13876 and *POxy.* 3, 413 (cf. Andrieu 189, Jory 66f.; a list of the sigla and directions in *POxy.* 3, 413 is given in Manteuffel o.c. 127). It may therefore well be that our papyrus was also intended to be an acting copy. If so, the generous use of accents, breathings etc. would be unparalleled in this kind of copy, but they are easier to explain in an acting copy (which, after all, had to be read correctly by the actors, for whom 'tragic' Greek certainly was very different from their daily language[11]) than the sigla would be in a reading text. Cengarle 66 argued that because of the lectional signs etc. the papyrus must be from a reading text, but his arguments are without substance.

The fact that our papyrus probably is from an acting copy should not, however, be used as an argument to support the theory that it contains only extracts from the play. Turner[1] 75 f. tried to do this, but could offer no real parallel (i.e. an extract containing algebraic symbols); cf. Lloyd-Jones[1] 445. In the fragments of New Comedy and mime mentioned by Turner[1] there is no indication that they contained only extracts. A papyrus of Menander (*POxy.* 3, 409 + 33, 2655 [II A.D.]) does contain extracts and probably they all come from the *Kolax* (that the papyrus contains extracts is proved by comparison with *POxy.* 10, 1237, which gives a fuller text; cf. Turner's introduction to *POxy.* 33, 2655 [p. 9]; Gomme-Sandbach 419), but there are no algebraic sigla. The lyrical extracts in *POslo* inv. 1413 A and B are of a different kind and should not be compared (cf. S. Eitrem - L. Amundsen, Symbolae Osloenses 31, 1955, 25-29). As to *POxy.* 25, 2436 (monody, II A.D.) there is no indication at all that this is an extract. On the possibility of a collection of extracts from *HF* and other plays (again without algebraic sigla) in *PHib.* 2, 179 see now Bond intr. *HF* XXXIII-XXXV; M. Cropp, ZPE 48, 1982, 67-73.

Yet, what is really fatal to the extract-theory is not so much the lack of parallels (even a mass of parallels could not, I think, prove that extracts and algebraic sigla *necessarily* went together), but the fact that it is unnecessary and creates more problems than it solves (see comm. on fr. 66, 48 ff. A and especially 56 f.).

3.2 *PFayum*

Editions:

Ed. princeps by R. A. Coles, *New literary and sub-literary fragments from the Fayum,* ZPE 6, 1970, 247 f. (nr. 1) (plate X a).

---

[11] As early as V B.C. scriptio plena without accents could cause trouble for actors: cf. Ar. *Ra.* 303 f.!

O. Musso, *Euripide Cresfonte*, Milano 1974, 15 f. (based on photograph).
H. J. Mette, Lustrum 17, 1973-74, 12 (apparently also not based on the original; the papyrus is here [wrongly] located in the British Museum).
Cf. also on this papyrus: Luppe[2] 244.
The papyrus is now in the papyrology-rooms in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford; there is no inventory number.

This scrap of papyrus (2.1 × 4.5 cms), which contains the remains of 8 or 9 lines was identified by the first editor as being from Euripides' *Kresphontes*, because lines 3-6 overlap with fr. 449. The papyrus was dated in the late first or early second century A.D. and the writing, which is along the fibres, described as "a plain literary hand with occasional ligatures" (Coles[1] 247 f.). The back is blank. In line 2 there is a blank space of 5 mms, of which the purpose is rather a mystery (see below). Where the papyrus overlaps with fr. 449 it offers no new readings.

As to the little blank space, it seems unlikely that this was accidental, as the surface of the papyrus is not damaged. Coles[1] 248 tried three explanations, none of them very satisfactory:

(1) there may be change of speaker, so that χ[indicates the name of a new speaker (cf. the lay-out in *POxy*. 36, 2746 [trag., I-II A.D.]). If so, the chorus would be the only candidate, because no (known) name in Euripides' play would fit, but it seems rather unlikely that we would find the chorus answering somebody in antilabe in Euripides and the piece of post-classical tragedy in *POxy*. 36, 2746 should not, I think, be adduced as a parallel for such a practice. Besides, if there was a siglum indicating the chorus I would rather expect $\overset{o}{\chi}$[(cf. Turner[7] 15 + n. 3), as χ[would imply χ[ορ, which is rather a Byzantine siglum (cf. Turner[7] ibid.) or single χ, which seems to be unparalleled as a siglum for the chorus (cf. Lowe 34 n. 48);.

(2) 1 and 2 may be part of an indented choral passage (Coles[1] compares *POxy*. 9, 1174 col. X 8-9). This, however, would give (a) an indentation of ± 20 letters (cf. also Coles[1]), (b) an uneven margin in the choral passage as the traces in 1 are not in alignment with χ[;

(3) "Could χ[ορός have been placed centrally, like χοροῦ in comic mss., but here referring to lines 3 ff.?" (Coles[1]; cf. also Luppe[2] 244), but Coles himself already objected to that, observing that again it would be rather far to the right, whereas 3 ff. would be "an odd utterance for a chorus" (cf. also intr. to fr. 449).

Some other possibilities are:

(4) χ[is the beginning of an utterance of a new speaker, the change of speaker being indicated by perhaps a paragraphos at the beginning of the line and a blank space in the middle. This method of indicating antilabe is common in comic papyri; cf. e.g. *POxy*. 33, 2654, 18; 32; 33 (Men. *Karch*., I A.D.); *PSorb*. inv. 2272 b (Men. *Sik*., III A.D.; cf. A. Blanchard - A. Bataille, RecPap 3, 1964, 109); *PHib*. 1, 5 fr. (a) col. II 20; 21 (New Com.,

III B.C.). In tragic papyri, however, where antilabe is much less frequent, the usual practice appears to be to write a line which is divided over two speakers on two separate lines; cf. e.g. *POxy.* 9, 1174 col. VIII 15ff. (S. *Ichn.*, II A.D.) and 1177 (E. *Ph.*, I A.D.); Lowe 33 + n. 31. But we may have an exception in a papyrus of Vth century tragedy in *POxy.* 27, 2460 fr. 10, 15 (E. *Telephos*, I A.D.), where we find a "line above cυ. Length mark or paragraphos indicating a change of speaker within the line" (Rea ad loc.). Anyway, the objection would not be fatal if the context strongly suggested antilabe. This, however, the context does not do. Antilabe in iambic trimeters is rare anyway in Euripides (cf. W. Ritchie, *The authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*, Cambridge 1964, 295f.) and if it appears it tends to be in a rather emotional context (so e.g. *Alc.* 390f., *Med.* 1009, *Hipp.* 310 etc.), not just before a gnomic digression like fr. 449, which may well be part of a rhesis. In trochaic tetrameters it is more common, but these are not attested in Euripides before *HF* (cf. intr. to *POxy.* 3, 419 + fr. 245 = 19 A);

(5) the blank space may indicate punctuation (cf. Turner[7] 10); again I have found no examples in tragic papyri, but that does not seem to be fatal;

(6) the papyrus may be from an anthology (I owe this suggestion to W. S. Barrett). Fr. 449, which was often quoted in antiquity, might very well appear in a gnomologium (for a similar situation cf. e.g. fr. 324, which apart from being quoted in several sources, also appeared in *PRoss-Georg.* 1, 9 (gnomol., II B.C.). Quite often the gnomologia in papyri offer passages which we also find in Stobaeus (many examples in O. Guéraud - P. Jouguet, *Un livre d'écolier*, Cairo 1938, XXVI-XXVIII; cf. also *PBerol.* 21144, ed. H. Maehler, MH 24, 1967, 70-73). In these papyri the name of the author is often put in the line which precedes the quotation, with some indentation (though it never comes as far to the right as our χ[ ); cf. e.g. *BKT* 5, 20 A (II B.C.), *PHib.* 1, 7 (III B.C.). Sometimes chapter headings or titles of plays are added; cf. e.g. *BKT* 5, 20 B (II B.C.), *PHib.* 2, 224 (III B.C.) (?) and *PSI* 15, 1476 (II-III A.D.); titles only: *POxy.* 45, 3214 (II A.D.). But even if the fragment is from a gnomologium it is not easy to explain χ[: it may be part of a loosely-spaced chapter heading or of a wrong attribution (e.g. ευριπιδου] χ[ρυcιπ-πoυ?) or 'something irregular' (cf. e.g. *PRoss-Georg.* 1, 9, where in line 6 we find αλλο [about 15 letters indented] followed by *Or.* 1155-56 in lines 7-8 and the irregularities of the lay-out in *PSI* 15, 1476). An additional difficulty is that, whereas fr. 449 seems to be self-contained, there is no indication in the papyrus that a new quotation started after line 6 (but see comm. on 7ff.).

All things considered no firm decision as to the nature of χ[seems possible.

TEXT

*test. 1

καίτοι τίνα βούλει cέ, Αἰcχίνη, καὶ τίν' ἐμαυτὸν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν εἶναι θῶ; βούλει ἐμαυτὸν μέν, ὃν ἂν cὺ λοιδορούμενος καὶ διαcύρων καλέcαις, βάτταλον, cὲ δὲ μηδ' ἥρω τὸν τυχόντα, ἀλλὰ τούτων τινὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆc cκηνῆc, Κρεcφόντην ἢ Κρέοντα ἢ ὃν ἐν Κολλυτῶι ποτ' Οἰνόμαον κακῶc ἐπέτριψαc;

*test. 2

Θεοδώρου δὲ τοῦ τῆc τραγωιδίαc ποιητοῦ ὑποκρινομένου τὴν Μερόπην cφόδρα ἐμπαθῶc, ὁ δὲ (sc. Alexander Pheraeus) εἰc δάκρυα ἐξέπεcεν, εἶτα ἐξανέcτη τοῦ θεάτρου.

*test. 3

εἰcίν, ὦ Μένιππε, τραγωιδοὶ πλείουc, ἐc οὓc Νέρων ἑαυτὸν γράφει· τί οὖν; εἴ τιc αὐτῶν μετὰ τὸν Οἰνόμαον ἢ τὸν Κρεcφόντην ἀπελθὼν τοῦ θεάτρου μεcτὸc οὕτω τοῦ προcωπείου γένοιτο, ὡc ἄρχειν μὲν ἑτέρων βούλεcθαι, τύραννον δὲ αὑτὸν ἡγεῖcθαι, τί καὶ φήcειc τοῦτον;

test. 4

Κρεcφόντηc

***test. 1** D.18, 180 (1, 287, 22 ff. Butcher) || **3** κακῶc ἐπέτριψαc *S*[1]: ὑποκρινόμενοc ante ἐπέτριψαc add. *L vulg*.
***test. 2** Ael. *VH* 14, 40 (182, 1 ff. Dilts) || **1** τῆc om. *x* | ποιητοῦ *V x*, τραγικοῦ *Φ*, ὑποκριτοῦ Nauck || **2** ⟨τῶν⟩ ὑποκρινομένων Koraïs | Μερόπην Valckenaer 182: ἀερόπην *V x Φ*, Ἑκάβην e Plu. *De Alex. M. fortuna* 1, 334 a Perizonius
***test. 3** Philostr. *VA* 5, 7, 193 (1, 169, 25 ff. Kayser[2]) || **2** ἑαυτὸν: αὑτὸν *s*, *a* (= *ed. Aldina*; de siglis vide Kayser) | γράφει: ἐγγράφει *v*, γράφει; *l* || **4** ἄρχειν: ἄρχει *s* || **5** αὑτὸν: αὐτον *E* (= *edd. veteres*) | ἡγεῖcθαι, τί καὶ: ἡγεῖcθαί τε καὶ *a*
test. 4 *IG* XIV 1152, 29 (a dextra) | Roma; index Euripidis fabularum || ΚΡΕC-ΦΟΝΤΥΕC Froehner, ΚΡΕCΦΟΝΤΥΣC Seguier et Kaibel (qui sic legit in ectypo), ΚΡΕCΦΟΝΤΥC Venuti

test. 5

(5ᵃ) *Polyphontes Messeniae rex Cresphontem Aristomachi filium cum interfecisset, eius imperium et Meropen uxorem possedit.*

(5ᵇ) ... *cum quo Polyphontes occiso Cresphonte regnum occupauit. (2) filium autem eius infantem Merope mater quem ex Cresphonte habebat absconse ad hospitem in Aetoliam mandauit. hunc Polyphontes maxima cum industria quaerebat, aurumque pollicebatur si quis eum necasset. (3) qui postquam ad puberem aetatem uenit, capit consilium ut exsequatur patris et fratrum mortem. itaque uenit ad regem Polyphontem aurum petitum, dicens se Cresphontis interfecisse filium et Meropes, Telephontem. (4) interim rex eum iussit in hospitio manere, ut amplius de eo perquireret. qui cum per lassitudinem obdormisset, senex qui inter matrem et filium internuntius erat flens ad Meropen uenit, negans eum apud hospitem esse nec comparere. (5) Merope credens eum esse filii sui interfectorem qui dormiebat, in chalcidicum cum securi uenit inscia ut filium suum interficeret. quem senex cognouit et matrem ab scelere retraxit. (6) Merope postquam uidit occasionem sibi datam esse ab inimico se ulciscendi, redit cum Polyphonte in gratiam. rex laetus cum rem diuinam faceret, hospes falso simulauit se hostiam percussisse, eumque interfecit, patriumque regnum adeptus est.*

test. 6

Κρεcφόντηc δὲ οὐ πολὺν Μεccήνηc βαcιλεύcαc χρόνον μετὰ δύο παίδων φονευθεὶc ἀπέθανε. Πολυφόντηc δὲ ἐβαcίλευcεν, καὶ αὐτὸc τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν τοῦ φονευθέντοc γυναῖκα Μερόπην ἄκουcαν ἔλαβεν. ἀνηιρέθη δὲ καὶ οὗτοc. τρίτον γὰρ ἔχουcα παῖδα Μερόπη καλούμενον Αἴπυτον ἔδωκε τῶι ἑαυτῆc πατρὶ τρέφειν. οὗτοc ἀνδρωθεὶc καὶ κρύφα κατελθὼν ἔκτεινε Πολυφόντην καὶ τὴν πατρώιαν βαcιλείαν ἀπέλαβεν.

test. 5 Hyg. *fab.* 137 + 184ᵉˣ· (100, 1 ff. Rose) | 184ᵉˣ· (5ᵇ) *F* ad *fab.* 184 adiungit; ad *fab.* 137 (5ᵃ) adiungunt Bursian e.a. (cf. Rose XV f.) || **2 et 12** *Meropen* Muncker: *Meropem F* || **10** *Meropes* Muncker: *Meropis F* | *uidit* post Micyllum Schaeffer et Muncker: *uenit F*
test. 6 Apollod. 2, 8, 4-6 (1, 105, 15 ff. Wagner) || **3** καὶ αὐτὸc Heyne: αὐτῶν *codd.*, αὐτὸc Faber || **4** Μερόπην ἄκουcαν Hercher: ἄκουcαν Μερόπην *A* || **5** Αἴπυτον Galeus: αἴγυπτον *A*

test. 7

῾Ο Ε ἔχει Κρεcφόντην ἀναιροῦντα Πολυφόντην, τοῦ πατρὸc τὸν φονέα· ἔcτι δὲ καὶ Μερόπη βάκτρον κατέχουcα καὶ cυνεργοῦcα τῶι υἱῶι πρὸc τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸc ἐκδικίαν

Κρεcφόντου γενέτην πέφνεc τὸ πάροc, Πολυφόντα,
κουριδίηc ἀλόχου λέκτρα θέλων βιάcαι·
ὀψὲ δέ οἱ πάιc ἧκε φόνωι γενέτηι προcαμύνων,
καί cε κατακτείνει ματρὸc ὑπὲρ Μερόπαc.
τοὔνεκα καὶ δόρυ πῆξε μεταφρένωι· ἁ δ' ἐπαρήγει,
βριθὺ κατὰ κροτάφων βάκτρον ἐρειδομένα.

test. 8

κράτιcτον δὲ τὸ τελευταῖον, λέγω δὲ οἷον ἐν τῶι Κρεcφόντηι ἡ Μερόπη μέλλει τὸν υἱὸν ἀποκτείνειν, ἀποκτείνει δὲ οὔ, ἀλλ' ἀνεγνώριcε.

test. 9

ἡ Μερόπη τοῦ περί τι παράδειγμά ἐcτι. καὶ ἔcτι παρ' Εὐριπίδηι ἐν τῶι Κρεcφόντηι ἐπιβουλεύουcα τῶι υἱῶι Κρεcφόντηι ὡc πολεμίωι δι' ἄγνοιαν.

test. 7 *A.P.* 3, 5 (1, 60, 3 ff. Stadtmueller) || **1-3** π (superscript ε) (= περὶ) τ⌜ου⌝ πέμπτ⌜ου⌝ | πινακοc *L* *m*[c] || **1** κρεcφόνην *A* || **3** ἐκδικίαν Boissonade: ἐκδημία¯ *A*, ζημίαν Jacobs || **4** κρεcφόντου (non κρεφόντου) *A* | γ˛ε˛νέτην *P*: γενέταν? Stadtmueller || **5** βιάcαι Stadtmueller: μιάναι *A*, μιανεῖν Meineke || **6** δέ οἱ: δέοι *A* (οἱ def. Stadtmueller), δέ cοι Hecker | ἧκε: ἧκ· εν (non ἧκεν *A* | φόνωι γενέτηι προcαμύνων: φόνον γενετῆροc ἀμύνων Jacobs, φίλωι γενέται? Stadtmueller
test. 8 Arist. *Po.* 1454 a 5 ff. (23, 3 ff. Kassel) || **2-3** μέλλει … ἀποκτείνει *A B*: *debebat … interfecit Lat.* || **3** ἀνεγνώριcε *Π*: ἐγνώριcε *B*
test. 9 Anon. in Arist. *EN* III 2, 1111 a 11 f. οἰηθείη δ'ἄν τιc καὶ τὸν υἱὸν πολέμιον εἶναι ὥcπερ ἡ Μερόπη (*CAG* 20, 146, 15 ff.) || **1** τοῦ *B*: om. *a* || **2-3** τῶι υἱῶι Κρεcφόντηι: κρεcφόντι τῶι υἱῶι *a*

POxy. 27, 2458

fr. 1 col. I

]. τεινδε̣[.]ω
]ν̣νικηc
]. ονοc
]οc
]πατηρ
]. ὑπο
]. ικον
]. ροc
]. ω̣ν
]υc
]c̣οc
]εκνα

fr. 1 col. II

ᾱ .[. . . . . . .]c̣ο̣ικωνδε[.]ποτηcπε̣ριξενουc̣
γ̄ ο̣[. . . .]. οδε̣ουκωνπαcιπροcφιλεcτατοc
ᾱ τ̣[. . . .]τ̣ιν·τονδεμηκετ’οντ’αυθιcφρα̣cον
γ̄ α̣[. .]. [.]κ̣λειδω̃νονομαπολυφοντηcξε̣νε
ᾱ [. . .]τ’θ̣ανωνδεδεcποτηcτίcὴνδομω̣ν

fr. 1 col. I 1]. τ:]τ Turner[1] (but some vertical ink at edge of papyrus) | ε̣[bottom visible at right-hand end of δ; just before the gap there is a little vert. trace, hard to explain as part of ε, but too close to be part of the next letter || **2**]ν̣:]η Turner[1], but the crossbar is oblique rather than horizontal || **3**]. remains of upright, bending over to the right at top; before the upright indefinite traces:]μ? Turner[1] || **6**]. a vert. trace || **7**]. end of oblique:]λ Turner[1] || **8**]. little hor. trace:]τ̣ Turner[1] || **9**]. a high speck of ink:]ι̣ Mette[1].

fr. 1 col. II 1 .[slightly sloping vert., bulging out at top; best consistent with μ (cf. fr. 1 col. III 15 μ̣νηcθε̣ν[ ), longer than usual because it is the first letter of the line: ἀ̣[Turner[1] (but the trace is too steep for α and shows no loop; some ink is broken away at the top, but there is clearly a continuous stroke and nothing to suggest lectional signs), μ̣[Austin || **2**]. :]ε̣ or]κ̣ Turner[1]; if ε, the bottom comes rather far to the right and it seems hard to explain a speck of ink at the basis, just left of the bottom; if κ, the upper oblique would be unusually flat; I can see no other letter that would fit || **3**]τ̣ιν· high stop regarded as "perhaps accidental" by Turner[1] || **4**]. [foot of a long descender:]ρ̣[Turner[1] || **5** [. .]: ο̣[. .] Turner[1], but I can see no ink | ἡ̃ν circumflexus changed into a thick gravis: *vice versa* Turner[1] ||

fr. 66 A

(fr. 1 col. I)

]. τειν δ'ε̣[.]ω
τυρα]ν̣νικῆς
]. ονος
]ος
] πατήρ
]. ὕπο
]λ̣ικον
]. ρος
]. ω̣ν
]υς
]ς̣ος
τ]έκνα

(fr. 1 col. II)

ΚΡ. μ̣[ῶν ἄδικο]ς̣ οἴκων δε[ς]πότης περὶ ξένους;
γ̄ ὁ̣ [ζῶν γ'], ὁ δ' οὐκ ὢν πᾶσι προσφιλέστατος.
ΚΡ. τ̣[ίς δ'ἔς]τ̣ι; τὸν δὲ μηκέτ' ὄντ' αὖθις φράσον.
γ̄ ἀ̣[φ' Ἡ]ρ̣[α]κ̣λειδῶν, ὄνομα Πολυφόντης, ξένε.
ΚΡ. [ὁ κα]τθανὼν δὲ δεσπότης τίς ἦν δόμων;

(fr. 1 col. I) 1 δ'ἐ̣[γ]ώ? Turner[1], αἰ]τεῖν δ'ἐ̣[γ]ὼ Mette[1] || **2** suppl. Barrett per litteras: 'Ελλ]ηνικῆς? Turner[1] || **3** ἐγὼ δ' ἐσώθην τῶν κασιγνήτων] μόνος e.g. Musso in comm. ad loc. || **6** γῆ]ς ὕπο? Musso[6] || **8** πα]τ̣ρός Turner[1]
(fr. 1 col. II) 13 init. suppl. Austin: ἆ[ρ' ὅσιο]ς̣ vel ἆ[ρ' ἄδικο]ς̣ Turner[1] || **14** ὁ̣ [ζῶν γ'] vel ὁ̣ [μὲν ὢν γ'] Dale apud Turner[1]: ὁ̣ [μὲν οὐ]κ̣ Turner[1], ὁ̣ [νῦν γ'] Kassel apud Austin || **15** τ̣[ίς δ' ἔς]τ̣ι Barrett apud Austin: τ̣[ίς ἐς]τ̣ι Turner[1] ||.

γ̄ τ̣α̣υ̣τ̣ο̣υ̣γενουςτον^{υ}δ'οιςθακρεςφοντην̣κλυων
ᾱ κτιςτη̣ραγεοντατηςδ̣εγηςμεςςηνια[
γ̄ τουτονκατακταςδωμαπολυφοντη̣.[.]χε̣ι
ᾱ ποτερα̣βιαιωςητυχαιςα̣κ̣ουςιο̣ις
γ̄ β̣ιαδολωςαςωςτυραννευ̣οιχθονος
] παιδαγ̣εοντακ̣αι . . ναικ̣οςαζυγα
]ουκ'αλλαδιςςουςςυνκ[. . .]κτεινενκο̣ρους
α . . α̣ςα'ολωλεδητακα̣[.]τεκνωνςπορα
γ̄ εἴςεςτιπαιδωνλοιπ̣[. .]ει̣περες^{ςτ}τετι
‾ πως̣τονγεθανατο̣[. . . .]τ̣υχαςϋπε̣κ'φυγῶν
γ̄ μαςτουπ̣ιθηλῆςς.[. . . .]οςῶνετ̣[.]'[. .].[
ᾱ εκδημο̣[.]ῶντη̣.[. . . . .]ωρια^{ο}ςχ̣.[
γ̄ μητρ̣[.].[.].τ̣η̣ρ̣νιν̣[
]'ξ̣ε.[. . . . .].[

. . . . .

7 γης γ corrected from c?: corrected from τ Turner[1] || 8 .[cap of rounded letter: c̣[Turner[1] || 9 -ο̣ις Lloyd-Jones[1]: -αις Turner[1] || 11].π triangular letter:]π Turner[1] | . . speck of ink at basis and foot of a long descender: γυ Turner[1] || 12]κτεινεν Lloyd-Jones[1]:]κτεινας̣ Turner[1] || 13 . . feet of letters: ηπ Turner[1] || 14 εἰς: εἴς Mette[1] | ςτε written thickly in correction of some mistake, then ςτ again supra lineam by a thinner pen: c supra lineam Turner[1] || 16 after μαςτου there would be room for a diastole | .[little oblique trace, clearly a single stroke: α̣[Turner[1], μ̣[Mette[1] | certainly not less than four letters in the gap | ετ̣[the horizontals seem to overlap, which excludes επ̣[(cf. fr. 1 col. II 3 μηκε̣τ̣' and fr. 2 col. II 2 ε̣π̣ειδ.[ ): επε.[Turner[1], ετ'ε[Mette[1], ετ'[Austin |]'[the trace is too high to be anything but a diastole (or part of a letter supra lineam):]ξ[Austin, not recorded by Turner[1] |].[top of letter, a little lower than the diastole: not elsewhere recorded || 17 .[ink consistent with cap of c: τη[Turner[1], τηc[Musso[6] |]ωρια^{ο}c Austin:]ωριας Turner[1] | χ.[after χ bottom of rounded letter (θ would fit): λα̣[Turner[1], χθ̣[Austin || 18 ρ̣[long vert. visible at edge of papyrus: η̣[? Austin |].[slightly rounded trace, consistent with bottom of c |]. top of triangular letter | then τ̣η̣ρ̣νιν̣[was read for me by W. S. Barrett (hor. of τ ligatured to η [cf. fr. 1 col. II 6 κρεςφοντ̣ην], traces which suggest two long descenders are on a piece of displaced papyrus: they should come higher up and then fit the verticals of τ and η [cf. fr. 1 col. II 7 τ̣ηc]; then loop of ρ and traces of descender; for ν̣[cf. fr. 1 col. II 13 τεκν̣ων):]. .ρον.λ[Turner[1],]. .ρον.λ[Austin || 19]'. ξε.[vert. trace with little curl upwards to the right at bottom, above this a little oblique trace cutting through the paragraphos,]ή would fit nicely; then a hor. with a rounded trace below it, only ξ seems to explain these traces; after ε perh. top of ι ligatured to ε (cf. fr. 1 col. III 14 υμε̣ι̣c):].εφ[Turner[1],].εφ.[Mette[1],]πεφ[Austin |].[supralinear traces (at the beginning of the line the interlinear space is 3 mms, here only 1 mm.), cf. perh. the flat acute accent in fr. 3, 3 τί:]ν̣τα̣[Turner[1],]. . .[Austin, but the first two of their letters are actually part of τ̣η̣ in the line above.

γ̄ ταὐτοῦ γένουϲ τοῦδ' οἶϲθα Κρεϲφόντην κλύων;
ΚΡ. κτιϲτῆρά γ' ὄντα τῆϲδε γῆϲ Μεϲϲηνία[ϲ.
γ̄ τοῦτον κατακτὰϲ δῶμα Πολυφόντηϲ [ἔ]χει.
ΚΡ. πότερα βιαίωϲ ἢ τύχαιϲ ἀκουϲίοιϲ;
γ̄ βίαι δολώϲαϲ, ὡϲ τυραννεύοι χθονόϲ.
⟨ΚΡ.⟩ ἄπαιδά γ' ὄντα καὶ γυναικὸϲ ἄζυγα;
⟨γ̄⟩ οὔκ, ἀλλὰ διϲϲοὺϲ ϲυγκ[ατέ]κτεινεν κόρουϲ.
ΚΡ. ἦ πᾶϲ' ὄλωλε δῆτα κα[ὶ] τέκνων ϲπορά;
γ̄ εἷϲ ἐϲτὶ παίδων λοιπ[όϲ], εἴπερ ἔϲτ' ἔτι.
⟨ΚΡ.⟩ πῶϲ τόν γε θάνατο[ν καὶ] τύχαϲ ὑπεκφυγών;
γ̄ μαϲτοῦ 'πὶ θηλῆϲ ϲμ[ικρ]ὸϲ ὢν ετ[.]' [..].[
ΚΡ. ἔκδημο[ϲ] ὢν τῆϲ[δ' ἢ 'πιχ]ώριοϲ χθ[ονόϲ;
γ̄ μητρ[ὸ]ϲ [π]ατὴρ νιν[
ΚΡ. ἥξει [.........].[

24 suppl. Lloyd-Jones[1] ‖ **28** ϲμ[ικρ]ὸϲ Mette[1], ϲμ[εικρ]οϲ scriptum fuisse putat Austin | in fine ἐτ'ἐ[ξέδυ Görschen apud Mette[1], ἐτ'[ἐ]ξ[έδυ Austin, ἐτ[ι]'[ἐν]τ[ροφαῖϲ? Radt per litteras ‖ **29** suppl. Barrett apud Austin: τῆ[ϲ μὴπιχ]ωρίαϲ λα[χών Turner[1] ‖ **30** μητρ[ὸ]ϲ [π]ατὴρ νιν [ἔτρεφεν Ἀρκάδων ἄναξ suppl. e.g. Barrett per litteras: μήτη[ρ ? Austin, μητ[ρὸϲ πολύ]φρονοϲ? Musso ‖ **31** ἥξει vel ἥξει[ν : πέφ[ευγε? Austin

fr. 3

. . . .

]. αιcο̣δε̣[

]. εc\γ/τεκλ. . [

]δητίπᾶιcομ. [

]α̣νοντοcταὺτ[

]ν’εχθ. . [

]υχιχρ̣η̣[

]. δ’αυτ[

. .

fr. 2 col. I

. .

].[

]. νετ. . [.]. . [

]άμαρτ’εχειν

]. . πόcι̣ν

]ηπάροcδερῆν

]. ιcεχθρουcεχει

]. αcαντιτ̣ειcετα[

]εαν\[γ]/γενοιτ\[λλ]/⟦ο⟧ε. [

]ἐ̣cτιαcι′θι

]. α̣. . [. . .]. . [

fr. 3 1]. upright with little curl to the right at foot,]π̣ most likely (no traces of oblique joining the vert. as with ν; no loop at top as is usual with η; curl excludes ι and γ): ν, γ or ι Turner[1],]π̣ Mette[1] | ε̣[: ε̣[or ω[Turner[1], but the beginning of the hor. is just visible at edge of papyrus || **2**]. indefinite traces | \γ/ Austin: τ Turner[1] | κλ. . [after λ feet of two parallel verticals, then a trace at the basis best consistent with the tiny loop at the bottom of ζ (though δ[cannot be altogether excluded): κα̣ι̣. [Turner[1], κλη̣. [Austin, κληδ[or κληζ[Barrett apud Austin || **3** ομ. [ο has a little 'tail' at its bottom, regarded by Barrett apud Austin as a deletion-mark, but rather due to the fact that it was written by two strokes of the pen (see comm. on fr. 66, 34 A) | . [foot of upright, η[would fit: α̣[Turner[1] (but the trace is too steep for α and there is no loop), η[Austin || **5** after θ a speck of ink at medium height, then a tear in the papyrus followed by a vert. trace and a little hor. trace near its top | . [perh. part. of rounded letter: ρ̣ο̣[or ι̣c̣[Turner[1] || **6**]υ:]. υ Turner[1],]ο̣υ Mette[1] (and others), but I can see no ink before υ || **7**]. high speck of ink, which may well be part of descender of υ in the line above. **fr. 2 col. I 1[a]**]. [foot of long descender with little curl to the left above τ in 1: not recorded by Turner[1] || **1**]. ν end of oblique trace joining ν at medium height,]α̣ν or]μ̣ν possible:]ν Turner[1] | . . [a little thickening at top of τ, which might be part of ο (cf. fr. 1 col. II 15 τ̣ο̣ν), then part of an oblique joining a vert., ν̣. perh. possible, but not very satisfactory: α̣ι̣ regarded as conceivable by Turner[1], ω̣ Mette[1] (but hook too sharp for ω) |]. . [bottom of vert., then a hor. trace (height consistent with e.g. the

(fr. 3)

] π̣αῖϲ ọδẹ[
]. εϲγεκλη.[
× – ⏑] δὴ τί παῖϲ ομη̣[× – ⏑ –
× –]α̣νόντοϲ ταυτ[⏑ – × – ⏑ –
]ν'εχθ. .[
ο]ὐχὶ χρ̣η̣[
]. δ' αυτ[

(fr. 2 col. I)

].[
]. νετ. .[.]. .[
δ]άμαρτ' ἔχειν
]. . πόϲιν
]η πάροϲ δέρην
]ε̣ιϲ ἐχθροὺϲ ἔχει
].αϲ ἀντιτείϲετα[ι
]ε ἂν γένοιτ' ἐμ̣[
] ἑϲτίαϲ ἴθι
] π̣α̣. .[. . .]. .[

(fr. 3) 33 κεκλη[μένοϲ? Musso[6] || **34** ὅμα̣[ιμοϲ Turner[1], A. ὄνομα δὲ] δὴ τί παῖϲ ἀλη[τεύει φέρων Barrett apud Austin, qui suspicatur ἀλητεύει in ὁμηρεύει corruptum fuisse || **35** θ]α̣νόντοϲ? Turner[1], Γ. τοῦ κατθ]α̣νόντοϲ ταὐτ[ὸ Κρεϲφόντου πατρόϲ e.g. Barrett apud Austin
(fr. 2 col. I) 39 ἀϲυ]νετω̣[τ]ε̣[ρ ⏑ Mette[1] || **40** fr. inc. 1060 ἐχθροῖϲιν εἴη πολεμίαν δάμαρτ' ἔχειν huc rettulit Mette[1], probavit Austin || **42** fort. εὐπρεπ]ῆ: ὁμογεν]ῆ? Musso[6] || **43** ϲυγγεν]εῖϲ ἐχθροὺϲ? Turner[1], ε]ἰϲ Mette[1] || **45** ἂν γένοιτ' vel ἀγγέλλοιτ' | ἐμ̣[οί Mette[1], ξέν]'(ε), ἂν γένοιτ' ἐμ[οί? Musso[6] in comm. ad loc.

---

crossbar of τ):].[Turner[1],]ε̣[Mette[1] || **2**]άμαρτ':]μη̣τ' or]μα̣ρτ' Musso[6] (but ρ is certain) || **3**]. . end of oblique or medium horizontal, then cap of rounded letter,]ε̣ϲ̣ or]α̣ϲ̣ possible:]. Turner[1] || **5**]. left end of medium hor.:]ε̣ Turner[1] || **6**]. speck of ink at bottom || **7** [ο] ο deleted by second hand (Austin) | .[slightly sloping vert.: μ̣[Turner[1] | Turner[1] prints a paragraphos below 7, but this must be a mistake || **9**].α̣. .[. . .]: two parallel vert.; after α̣ a long descender; then indefinite traces: .]π̣α̣ρ̣[. . .] Turner[1],]π̣α̣ρ̣.[. .] Austin (*al. alia*).

fr. 1 col. III

γυνηδε.[
πocίντε'υ[
ξεναιδ'ε.[
κλαιουcα· χα̣[
ᾱ αιαι·τιδρα[
πωcδ'αθλ̣[
δε̣ιcεωτα̣λ̣[
ξιφοc̣τεθ.[
ὤνε̣ρτ̣ερ̣.[
[⁻⁽⁻]
αῖδη.[
...ʽ[
[1 line lost]
].υδ[..].[
νυνϊποτ[
ϋμειcτεα.[
μνηcθε̣ν[
⟦πατροc̣⟧cφ[
ωφιλτατε̣[
..]π̣τ̣ηcτα[
.].ινυνμ[
...[.]..[
. . .

fr. 1 col. III 1 .[vertical trace at edge of pap.: δε[Vysoký || **2** diastole represented by specks of ink: τε'υ[, τεα̣υ[or τελ̣υ[Turner[1], but neither room nor traces suit α or λ || **3** ξεναιδ'ε.[Barrett apud Austin (who placed the little scrap of papyrus containing δ'ε.[cα·χα̣[after fr. 1 col. III 3-4 instead of 4-5 where it had been placed by Turner[1] (cf. also comm. on fr. 66, 50 A): ξεναι[Turner[1] | .[slightly sloping vertical with a hook to the right at its bottom, ε̣[or c̣[possible: λ̣[Turner[1], but λ excluded by the hook; α̣[or c̣[Austin, but α would not be so steep || **4** κλαίουcα·χα̣[Barrett apud Austin, κλαιου[..] δ'ελ̣[Turner[1] (cf. on 3) | α̣[: ε̣[just possible Turner[1], but top excludes ε; .[Musso[6] || **5** δρα[Barrett apud Austin: δραcα·χα[Turner[1] (cf. on 3) || **7** ταλ̣[Mette[1] (parts of λ visible on loose fibres): τα̣[Turner[1] || **8** .[vertical on edge of pap.: η̣[Turner[1] || **9** .[top of triangular letter: α̣[Turner[1] || **10** [⁻⁽⁻] αῖδη thin stroke through ⁻⁽⁻, apparently meant to delete these signs; below all this a thin circumflexus is written over ι: αῖδη Turner[1], ᾱῖδη Mette[1] | .[top and bottom suggest δ, but there is more ink than I can account for: δ̣[or perhaps ξ[Turner[1] || **11** ...ʽ[1. top of triangular letter? above it there may be a rough breathing, unless ι in the line above had an unusual hook at its bottom; 2. just possibly upper part of ν, but another triangular letter followed by an upright is also conceivable; 3. perhaps consistent with loop and top of α: .ν.ʽ[Turner[1]; .νε̣[Musso[3] 151; .ν.[Musso[6] || **12**]. best consistent with]ο̣:]ο̣ Turner[1],]c̣ Mette[1];]γ,]λ̣ or]τ̣ Turner[4] 256;]. Austin |].[bottom of vertical | paragraphos below the line Mette[1], but see comm. on fr. 66, 48 ff. A || **13** γ̣̄ νυνϊ ποτ[Mette[1], wrongly (see comm.) ||

(fr. 1 col. III)

γυνὴ δε̣.[
πόσιν θ'ὑ[
ξέναι δ'ε .[
κλαίουϲα· χα̣[
KP. αἰαῖ· τί δρά[ϲω
πῶϲ δ' ἀθλ̣[
δεῖ ϲ', ὦ τάλ̣[αϲ
ξίφοϲ τεθη̣[
ὦ νερτερα̣[
Ἅιδη δ̣[
. . .ʿ[
[deest versus 1]
].υδ[. .].[
νῦν, εἴ ποτ'[
ὑμεῖϲ τεα.[
μνηϲθέν[τ
ϲφ[
ὦ φίλτατε [
. .]π̣ηϲτα[
κ]α̣ὶ νῦν μ[
. . .[.]. .[

(fr. 1 col. III) 48 γυνὴ δέ[δοικε? Vysoký || **49** πόσιν τε ὑ[πονοεῖ Mette[1], ποςίν Austin || **50** ξέναι δ' ἐ[πὶ χθονὶ? Musso[6] in comm. ad loc. || **52** suppl. Austin || **53** πῶϲ δ' ἀθλ[ι Mette[1], ἀθλ[ίαν Vysoký || **54** δεῖ ϲ', ὦ τά[λαινα e.g. Turner[1], δεῖ ϲε, ὦ τάλ[αϲ, νῦν Mette[1] || **55** θη[κτόν, θή[γειν, τέθη[κα Turner[1], τέθη[κται vel τεθῆ[χθαι Kassel apud Austin (τέθη[κται etiam W. Morel apud Mette[2] 66), ξίφοϲ τε θή[γειν καὶ δίκην λαβεῖν ταχύ e.g. Barigazzi apud Musso[6] || **56** fr. 456 †ὠνητέραν† δὴ τήνδ' ἐγὼ δίδωμί ϲοι / πληγήν improbabiliter huc rettulit Turner[1] | ὦ νέρτερ' α.[Mette[1], ὦ νέρτερ' Ἅ[ιδη? Austin, ὦ νερτέρα[ϲ ὑπὸ χθονόϲ? Musso[6], e.g. ὦ νέρτερ' ἀ[εὶ ϲκῆπτρ' ἔχων Radt per litteras || **56 f.** fortasse ὦι νερτέραι[⏓–⏑–⏓–⏑–] Ἅιδηι Turner[1] || **59** οὐδ[Lloyd-Jones[1], ϲὺ δ'[Mette[1] || **60** corr. Turner[1]: ȳ νυνί ποτ'[Mette[1] || **61** ὑμεῖϲ τ'ἀ.[vel ὑμεῖϲ θ'ἀ.[vel ὑμεῖϲ τ'εα.[: ὑμεῖϲ τε ἃ ϲ̣[Mette[1], ὑμεῖϲ τ'α[Musso[6], ὑμεῖϲ τ'ἐάϲ̣[ετ' Snell in margine || **62** μνηϲθέν[τεϲ suppl. Turner[1] || **63** ϲφ[αγέντοϲ? Musso[6] || **64** ὦ φίλτατ'ἐ[λθὼν Mette[1] || **65** ᾱ]. .π̣ηϲ τα[Mette[1], λύ]πηϲ? Musso[6] || **66** suppl. Turner[1], μ[(ε) Mette[1]

---

14 α.[: αϲ̣[Turner[1], which fits || **16** πατροϲ̣ is deleted by superposed dots | paragraphos below the line Mette[1], but see comm. || **19**].ι end of oblique joining ι: .]α̣ι̣ Turner[1] || **20** 1. speck of ink, probably from the top of a letter; 2. oblique joining vertical? 3. upright;]. .[: supralinear traces: .ν[. .]. .[Turner[1], . . .[.]. .[Austin (*al. alia*).

fr. 2 col. II

. . .

].cυ.....[
τα^{δ}αλλα
].εc·επειδ.[
$\overset{o}{χ}$ αιαι·φευ[
βαρεαγο[
πολυε.[
μελεαδ᾽.[
εκλαυcα[
τυρανν.[
τ̣ουπα.[
.]π̣ολυ̣...[
οcιον.[

fr. 4

. .

]....μ̣[
]ωνεχ̣ε̣[
]λ̣εγουc̣[
]ζ̣..[
]μ̣..[
]π̣ε̣[

. .

fr. 5

. . .

].ε̣χωδεπ̣[
]ξενοc[

. . .

fr. 6

. .

]τ̣[

.

fr. 2 col. II 1]. some ink at edge of papyrus | after cυ oblique trace; then bottom of ε or c possible; a long descender; foot of slightly sloping vert.; feet of two parallel uprights || **2**]. two specks of ink at medium height: not recorded by Turner[1] | τα^{δ}αλλα: ταα λλα supra lineam Turner[1], but there clearly is a little δ above the second

(fr. 2 col. II)

]̣ cυ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[
]̣ εc· τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐπειδ ̣[
XO. αἰαῖ· φευ[
βαρέα γο[
πολυεπ̣[
μελεα δ' ̣[
ἔκλαυcα[
τυραννẹ[
τοῦ παλ̣[
̣]π̣ολυ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[
ὅcιον ̣[

(**fr. 2 col. II**) **69** × ⏑]εc· Mette[1], ἔθα]νεc? Webster 140,]εc· ἐπει δ[vel]εc τἄλλ' ἐπειδ[Musso[6] in comm. || **70** φεῦ [φεῦ? Musso[6] || **71** βαρέα γο[ῶ Turner[1] || **73** μέλεα vel μελέα (etiam Musso[6]) || **74** ἔκλαυcα [? || **75** τυρανν̣[ίαν vel τυρανν̣[ίδα? Musso[6] || **76** πάλ̣[αι vel sim.? (vide comm.)

α | δ ̣[after δ speck of ink below the line, best consistent with ε or ω: δ[Turner[1] || **5** ̣[γ[or π̣[possible: π[Turner[1] || **6** ̣[vert. trace at edge of papyrus, η̣[possible, but perh. it must be connected with a bit of high ink, just after the diastole; if so, υ̣[would fit (cf. fr. 1 col. II 9 α̣κ̣ο̣υ̣cι̣ο̣ιc) || **8** ̣[some high ink (part of supralinear letter?) and a speck of ink at medium height: not recorded by Turner[1] || **9** ̣[oblique trace suggesting top of triangular letter (cf. fr. 1 col. II 12 α̣λ̣λα), excluding τ: not recorded by Turner[1] || **10** ̣]π̣ολυ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[after υ some low ink; then a descender, followed by a vaguely triangular blot, perh., but not cogently part of δ or α: [̣] π̣ολυ̣[Turner[1], ̣π̣ολυ ̣ ̣ ̣[Mette[1] || **11** ̣[some ink to the right of the top of ν, half covered by displaced fibres.
fr. 4 1] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣μ̣[ ]κ̣ seems to account best for the traces; then bottom of high rounded letter, ο possible; long descender, spacing and thickening suggest ρ or υ, rather than ι; then again part of high rounded letter, ο possible; so]κ̣ο̣υ̣ο̣μ̣[would fit nicely:] ̣ ̣ ̣ε̣ι̣c̣[or] ̣ ̣ρ̣ο̣ι̣c̣[Turner[1],] ̣ ̣υ̣ε̣μ̣[Austin (μ fits exactly; if ιc, the letters would come unusually close together) || **4**]ζ ̣ ̣[after ζ descender and a slightly sloping trace to the right of it; then part of upright and horizontal:]ζυ̣γ̣[Turner[1], which would fit || **5** ̣ ̣[the merest traces.
fr. 5 1] ̣ some ink along edge of papyrus: not recorded by Turner[1] | π̣[if the traces of the right upright, which are very vague indeed, are illusionary, γ[is also possible.
fr. 6 This fragment is not in the glass in the British Library and presumably lost.

PFayum

. .

]. .[
] χ[
]λ̣ογον[
]cocαε[
]πονων̣[
]ν̣τακε.[
]ω̣τατοι[
]ο̣νειc.[
].οcω[

. .

P.Fayum 1]. clearly a triangular letter, but hor. trace at bottom suggests δ rather than α:]α̣? Coles[1] | .[speck of ink || **2** before χ a blank space of 5 mms | there is a little stroke at the left hand top of χ, probably a decoration || **6** .[upright: κ̣[Coles[1] || **8** .[rounded trace and part of crossbar, which suggest ε: ε̣[Coles[1] || **9**]. little oblique trace at medium height and a speck of ink to the left of it; I can think of no letter that would fit.

fr. 449 + P.Fayum 1-9 *PFayum* (ed. R. A. Coles, ZPE 6, 1970, 247 f.) || **3-6** S.E. *P.* 3, 175 (1, 195, 9 Mutschmann-Mau) ὁ γοῦν Εὐριπίδηc φηcίν· '...' | Clem. Al. *Strom.* 3, 15, 2 (2, 202, 13 Stählin) ἀκόλουθα δ' αὐτοῖc (sc. Thgn. 425 ff.) καὶ ὁ τῆc τραγωιδίαc ποιητὴc Εὐριπίδηc γράφει '...' | Theodoret. *Therap.* 5 p. 71, 12 (125, 9 Raeder) ξυνωιδὰ δὲ τούτοιc (sc. Thgn. 425-7) καὶ τῆc Εὐριπίδου τραγωιδίαc τὰ ἰαμβεῖα· '...' | Stob. 4, 52, 42 (5, 1084, 15 Hense) Εὐριπίδου '...' (lemma om. *S*) | *Codex Paris.* 2720 (Schneidewin, *Progymn. in Anthol. Gr.* 31) (teste Nauck) | Σ Hermog. *in Rhet.* 7, 765, 17 Walz αἱ μὲν (sc. τῶν γνωμῶν) λεληθυῖαν ἔχουcι τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, αἱ δὲ φανεράν· λεληθυῖαν μέν, ὡc αἱ τοιαῦται· '...' τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὸν φύντα θρηνεῖν ἀπόδειξιc τό, εἰc ὅc' ἔρχεται κακά· ὡcαύτωc καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ θανόντι χαίρειν τὸ πόνων λελαcμένον | Arsen. 25, 37; 30, 54 et 44, 25 (Apostol. 8, 24 c [*CPG* 2, 433, 13] = *Viol.* 250, 7 Walz '...' Cοφοκλέουc (Εὐριπίδου 44, 25, om. 30, 54) || **3-4** Aristid. *Or.* 3, 267 (1, 384, 8 Lenz-Behr) εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην μάρτυρα ἐπάγοιτο λέγοντα ὅτι '...', ἦ που cφόδρα ἄν τι δόξειε λέγειν || **4-6** Strabo 11, 11, 8 p. 520 C (8, 102, 18 Lasserre) τοῖc μὲν γὰρ νόμιμον εἶναί φαcι τὸ τοῦ Εὐριπίδου '...' | Men. Rhet. *Epid.* 2, 413, 27 (Wilson-Russell) θαυμάζω δὲ εἰ μὴ ἐπελήλυθεν ὑμῖν, ὦ παρόντεc γονεῖc, ἐννοεῖν, ἅ φηcιν ἄριcτοc ποιητὴc Εὐριπίδηc ...· χρὴ γὰρ τὸν μὲν 'φύντα — δόμων'. οὐ θήcειc δὲ ἐξ ἅπαντοc τὰ ἰαμβεῖα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ cυνήθη τοῖc πολλοῖc καὶ γνώριμα, ἀλλὰ παρωιδήcειc μᾶλλον; | Plu. *De audiendis poetis* 14, 36 e-f (1, 74, 20 Paton-Wegehaupt-Pohlenz) προακηκοότεc γὰρ ἐν τοῖc ποιήμαcι καὶ προανεγνωκότεc '...' || **4-5** D. Chr. 23, 2 (2, 273, 25 Von Arnim) ἕτεροc δὲ ποιητὴc οὐκ ἰδίαι οὕτωc, ἀλλὰ κοινῆι πρὸc θέατρον ἀγωνιζόμενοc εἰcηγεῖται '...' χαίρονταc καὶ cυνηδομένουc οἴεται δεῖν

fr. 449 + *PFayum* (fr. 449 = 67 A)

]. .[
] χ[
ἐχρῆν γὰρ ἡμᾶς cύλ⌋λογον ⌊ποιουμένουc
τὸν φύντα θρηνεῖν εἰ⌋c ὅc᾽ ἔ⌊ρχεται κακά,
τὸν δ᾽ αὖ θανόντα καὶ⌋ πόνων ⌊πεπαυμένον
χαίροντας εὐφημοῦ⌋ντας ἐ⌊κπέμπειν δόμων
]ω̣τατοι[
]ο̣νειc.[
].οcω[

ἐκπέμπειν || **4** [Pl.] *Ax.* 368 a 5 (Burnet) ὁ δὲ κελεύων '...', τί coι φαίνεται; | Procop. Gaz. *Ep.* 164, 18 (p. 79 Garzya-Loenertz) ὅπερ (sc. Thgn. 425) ἡ cκηνὴ παραcπάcαcα δεῖν ἡμᾶc φηcὶν ἐπὶ cύλλογον ἰόνταc '...'. τί οὖν ἔτι θρηνοῦμεν ἐκ τῆc τοῦ βίου ζάληc ἀcφαλῶc τοὺc φιλτάτουc προπέμψαντεc, πρὶν ἐν πείραι γενέcθαι τῶν ἐντεῦθεν κακῶν || **6** Plu. *Quaest. conviv.* 1, 2, 1, 615 d (4, 9, 15 Hubert) ἐκεῖνον μὲν οὖν πολλῶι γέλωτι '...' ἐκέλευον οἱ κατακείμενοι | Sen. *Apoc.* 4, 2 (Waltz) *Claudium autem iubent omnes* '...' || **6** respicit Heliod. 7, 11, 9 (2, 133, 11 Rattenbury-Lumb) ὀδυρόμενοι καὶ θρηνοῦντεc ἄνδρα προφήτην, ὃν χαίρονταc καὶ εὐφημοῦνταc ἐκπέμπειν ὡc τῆc βελτίονοc μετειληχότα λήξεωc καὶ πρὸc τῶι κρειττόνων κεκληρωμένον ὁ θεῖοc καὶ ἱερὸc παρεγγυᾶι λόγοc || **3-6** fortasse respicit fr. com. adesp. 1224 (3, 611 Kock) ἔδει γὰρ ἡμᾶc τῶι θεῶι θύειν, ὅταν / γυνὴ κατορύττηται τάφωι, οὐχ ὅταν γαμῆι (cf. E. fr. dub. et spur. 1112) || **4-6** fortasse respicit *PFlinders Petrie* 1, 9 fr. 1, 5-9 καυcιανοιc δε νομ[ιμον τουc μεν / γινομενουc θρηνειν[/ δ . . . ου των τα[/ ν[. . .]cιν ωc πολλω[ν καματων? / αναπεπαυμεν[ων || **3-6** Latine vertit Cicero *Tusc.* 1, 48, 115 (277, 3 Pohlenz) (qui fabulae nomen unus prodidit) *qua est sententia in Cresphonte usus Euripides: 'nam nos decebat coetus celebrantis domum / lugere, ubi esset aliquis in lucem editus, / humanae uitae uaria reputantis mala; / at qui labores morte finisset gravis, / hunc omni amicos laude et laetitia exsequi'.*

fr. 449 + P.Fayum 3 ἐχρῆν: ἔδει Clem. Al., Σ Hermog., Aristid. (cf. fr. com. adesp. 1224) | γὰρ: μὲν Stob. *S*, Arsen., om. S.E. *L*, Stob. *Mac.* | ἡμᾶc: ὑμᾶc Theodoret. *K S M* γρ. | cύλλογον: cυλλόγουc Σ Hermog. *Par.*, Aristid. *V R*[1] (corr. *R*[2]), cυλλογιcμούc Σ Hermog. *Mon.* (cf. *coetus* Cic.), εὔλογον Stob. *A Mac.*, in contextu ἐπὶ cύλλογον (Westermann: cυλλόγων *A a*) ἰόνταc Procop. || **4** φύντα: ζῶντα Stob. *S A*, Arsen., τοὺc ζῶνταc Arsen. 44, 25, φῶτα [Pl.] *Y* | εἰc: ἐc Aristid. *V R*[1] *E U* | ὅc᾽: ὅcα Aristid. *Q*, Dio Chr. *U B M*, ὅcων Aristid. *M* | ἔρχεται: ἔρχονται Arsen. 44, 25 || **5** om. Theodoret. *S* | καὶ: ὡc Strabo *o z* (teste Kramer), κἀκ Wecklein 5 n. 2 | πόνων: κακῶν S.E. | πεπαυμένον: ex -μένων corr. Stob. *A*[1], λελαcμένον Σ Hermog. (sed. πεπαυμένον *Ven.*) || **6** ΧΑΙΡΟΝΤΑΙCΕΥΦΗΜΟΙΤΑΙC Sen. *S*, *gaudentes et benedicentes* S.E. *T* (= *translatio Latina*).

fr. 450 = 68 A

(ΚΡ.) εἰ μὲν γὰρ οἰκεῖ νερτέρας ὑπὸ χθονὸς
ἐν τοῖσιν οὐκέτ' οὖσιν, οὐδὲν ἂν σθένοι

fr. 451 = 69 A

(ΜΕΡ.) εἰ γάρ σ' ἔμελλεν, ὡς σὺ φῄς, κτείνειν πόσις,
χρῆν καὶ σὲ μέλλειν, ὡς χρόνος παρήλυθεν

fr. 452 = 70 A

(ΠΟΛ.?) ἐκεῖνο γὰρ πέπονθ' ὅπερ πάντες βροτοί·
φιλῶν μάλιστ' ἐμαυτὸν οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι

fr. 450 [Plu.] *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 15, 110 b (1, 226, 24 Paton-Wegehaupt-Pohlenz) ὁ Κρεσφόντης δέ που ὁ παρὰ τῶι Εὐριπίδηι περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους λέγων '...'. τοῦτο μεταποιήσας εἴποις ἂν 'εἰ — οὐδὲν ἂν πάθοι' ("qui primus versum deflexit, fort. scripsit στένοι" Pohlenz)
fr. 451 Gell. *NA* 6, 3, 28 (1, 226, 1 Marshall) *'Recteque' inquit* (sc. Tiro) *'hoc uitio dat Lucilius* (fr. 1169 Marx) *poetae Euripidae, quod, cum Polyphontes rex propterea se interfecisse fratrem diceret, quod ipse ante de nece eius consilium cepisset, Meropa, fratris uxor, hisce adeo eum uerbis eluserit '...'. At hoc enim' inquit 'plane stultitiae plenum est eo consilio atque ea fini facere uelle aliquid, uti numquam id facias, quod uelis'.*
fr. 452 1-2 Σ *B Med.* 84 (2, 148, 23 Schwartz) τῆι δὲ διανοίαι ταύτηι, καὶ ἐν Κρεσφόντηι κέχρηται οὕτως '...' (κρεοφόντη *cod.*) | *Floril. Euripid.* in *Apophthegm. Vindob.* 139 Wachsmuth (teste Nauck) || **2** Σ *A Med.* 84 (2, 148, 30 Schwartz) ἄλλως· ἢ τίς οὐ κακὸς περὶ φίλους πρὸς πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ συμφέρον; καὶ ἐν Κρεσφόντηι '...' (κρεωφον^τ *cod.*)

fr. 450 1 νερτέρας: νερτέρου *Δ υ B*
fr. 451 1 κτείνειν: κτενεῖν maluit Nauck || **2** χρῆν corr. I. Casaubonus apud I. Tornaesium, *Auli Gellii, Noctes Atticae* ..., Lugd. Batavorum 1592, in capite *Doctorum virorum in aliquot A. Gellii locos coniecturae* [p. 2 f.]: χρὴ *V* | ὡς: ἕως Valckenaer 183 | χρόνος: χόλος L. Müller, *C. Lucili Saturarum Reliquiae*, Lipsiae 1872, 105 "probante Nauckio" | παρήλυθεν Hertz: παρηαλυθεν *V*, παρῆν (παρὴ al.) δῆθεν *recc.* teste Hertzio (inde δῆθεν παρῆι Casaubonus, δῆθεν παρῆν I. F. Gronovius, *Auli Gellii Noctes Atticae*, Lugd. Batavorum 1687, 182 et ser. II. 127), †ὡς χρόνος παρήλυθεν† Cengarle 72, †παρηαλυθεν† Mette[5] 158
fr. 452 2 φίλων μάλισθ' ἑαυτὸν Σ *A*

fr. 453 = 71 A

(ΧΟ.) Εἰρήνα βαθύπλουτε καὶ — στρ.
καλλίστα μακάρων θεῶν,
ζῆλός μοι σέθεν ὡς χρονίζεις.
δέδοικα δὲ μὴ πόνοις
ὑπερβάληι με γῆρας,
πρὶν σὰν προσιδεῖν χαρίεσσαν ὥραν
καὶ καλλιχόρους ἀοιδὰς
φιλοστεφάνους τε κώμους.
ἴθι μοι, πότνα, πόλιν,

τὰν δ' ἐχθρὰν Στάσιν εἶργ' ἀπ' οἴ- — ἀντ.
κων τὰν μαινομέναν τ' Ἔριν
θηκτῶι τερπομέναν σιδάρωι

fr. 453 Stob. 4, 14, 1 (4, 370, 4 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Κρεσφόντου '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (κρέσφ^{o} addita compendii nota *S* qui chori signum servavit, κρέσφον^{τ} *M*, κρεσφόντου *A*) ‖ **1-7** Plb. 12, 26, 5 (3, 222, 12 Büttner-Wobst) ὁμογνωμονεῖν (sc. dicit Hermocrates teste Timaeo *FGrH* 566 F 22) δὲ τῶι ποιητῆι (sc. Homero de bello [*Il.* 5, 890 f.; 9, 63 f.]) καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην, ἐν οἷς φησιν '...' (versus continuo scripti sunt in *M S*, signis discernuntur in *F*)

fr. 453 1 Εἰρήνα: Εἰρήνη Stob., Εἰράνα Blaydes 136 | καὶ om. Plb. ‖ **4** μὴ πόνοις Hartung 2, 53: μὴ πρὶν πόνοις (πόνοις ex πόνους corr. *S*[1], πόνων *Tr.*) Stob., μὴ πρὶν Plb., μὴ πρῶι πόνοις F. W. Schmidt 2, 470 ‖ **5** γῆρας: η in ras. Stob. *A* ‖ **6** πρὶν σὰν Grotius[1] 209 (πρὶν σὴν Gesner[1] in margine Stob.): πρὶν γὰρ Stob. *S M*, πρίν περ Stob. *A*, πρὶν ἂν Plb. *F S*, ἢ πρὶν ἂν Plb. *M* (teste Hultsch) | προσιδεῖν χαρίεσσαν ὥραν transp. Austin metri causa: χαρίεσσαν προσιδεῖν ὥραν Plb., χαρίεσσαν προειδεώραν Stob. *S*, χαρίεσσαν προειδε ὥραν Stob. *M*, χαρίεσσαν προϊδεῖν ὥραν Stob. *A*, χαρίεσσαν ὥραν προσιδεῖν L. Kayser, RhM 7, 1850, 119, χαρίεσσαν ἰδεῖν ὥραν Page apud Austin ‖ **7** καλλιχόρους Stob. *A*, Plb., καλλιχρόνους Stob. *S M* ‖ **8** κώμους ex χώρους corr. Stob. *A*[1] ‖ **9** πότνα Berk (teste Meineke Stob. 2, p. XXVII f.): πότνια *codd.*, ⟨ἴθι⟩ ἴθι μοι, πότνια, πόλιν J. Diggle, Papyrologica Florentina 7, 1980, 59 | πόλιν: πάλιν Bergk apud Meineke *FCGr* II 2, 988, ταχὺ Schmidt ‖ **10** τὰν δ' Bergk: τάνδ' *S M A* | ἀπ' οἴκων: ἀπὸ οἴκων *A* ‖ **11** μαινομέναν ex μαινομένων corr. *S*[1], μαινομέναν *M A*, sed αν ex parte in ras. *M* ‖ **12** θηκτῶι: θνητῶι *A* | σιδάρωι: σιδήρωι *Tr.*

fr. 454 = 72 A

(ΜΕΡ.) τεθνᾶcι παῖδες οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνηι βροτῶν
οὐδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐcτερήμεθ', ἀλλὰ μυρίαι
τὸν αὐτὸν ἐξήντληcαν ὡc ἐγὼ βίον

fr. 455 = 73 A

καὶ δὶc ἕπτ' αὐτῆc τέκνα
Νιόβηc θανόντα Λοξίου τοξεύμαcιν

fr. 456 = 74 A

(ΜΕΡ.) †ὠνητέραν† δὴ τήνδ' ἐγὼ δίδωμί cοι
πληγήν

fr. 454 [Plu.] *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 15, 110 d (1, 227, 17 Paton-Wegehaupt-Pohlenz) ἡ δὲ Μερόπη λόγουc ἀνδρώδειc προφερομένη κινεῖ τὰ θέατρα, λέγουcα τοιαῦτα '...'
fr. 455 Σ *M T A*[1] *B Ph.* 159 (1, 271, 8 Schwartz) περὶ δὲ τοῦ πλήθουc τῶν Νιοβιδῶν αὐτόc φηcιν ὁ Εὐριπίδηc ἐν Κρεcφόντηι '...' (ἐν κρεοφαν *M*, ἐν κρεοφαν *T*, ἐν κρεοφων *A*[1], ἐν κρεοφόντηι *B*) | respicit Gell. *NA* 20, 7, 2 (2,598, 21 ff. Marshall) ... *Homerus* (sc. *Il.* 24, 602) *pueros puellasque eius bis senos dicit fuisse, Euripides bis septenos* | respicit fort. etiam Σ B. fr. 20 d 6 Snell-Maehler ἀντιλογί]α ἐcτὶν περὶ [τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ. Ὅμηρόc φηcι γ]εγενῆcθαι ἕξ [υἱοὺc καὶ ἕξ θυγατ]έραc, ἑπτὰ καὶ [ἑπτὰ Εὐριπίδ]ηc, δέκα καὶ δ[έκα Βακχυλίδηc] καὶ Π[ίν]δαροc[c
fr. 456 Plu. *De esu carnium* 2, 5, 998 e (VI, 1, 110, 23 Hubert) cκόπει δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐν τῆι τραγωιδίαι Μερόπην ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτὸν ὡc φονέα τοῦ υἱοῦ πέλεκυν ἀραμένην καὶ λέγουcαν '...' ὅcον ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι κίνημα ποιεῖ, cυνεξορθιάζουcα φόβωι, καὶ δέοc μὴ φθάcηι τὸν ἐπιλαμβανόμενον γέροντα καὶ τρώcηι τὸ μειράκιον

fr. 454 2 ἐcτερήμεθ': ἐcτέρην μι' Bothe 159 || **3** βίον: πότμον A. Nauck, *Tragicae Dictionis Index*, St. Petersburg 1892, XXII
fr. 455 1 αὐτῆc: dubitat num sanum sit Nauck, αὖθιc H. van Herwerden, Mnem. N.S. 17, 1889, 269, ἔφθ' ἑξῆc id., Mnem. N.S. 22, 1894, 235 || **2** Νιόβηc: fortasse glossema Blaydes 136 et West 75, Νιόβη Hartung 2, 51 || **1-2** κεῖδεν δὶc — τέκνα / Νιόβη Bothe 159, Νιόβηc τε μόχθουc καὶ — τέκνα / ὁμοῦ Wecklein 12 n. 1, Νιόβηc τε μόχθουc καὶ — τέκνα / εἶδον? Blaydes, τὴν Ταντaλείαν καὶ — τέκνα / ὁμοῦ e.g. Barrett per litteras, fort. καὶ — τέκνα / ὁμοῦ (vel κακῶc vel οἰκτρῶc?) θανόντα — τοξεύμαcιν / τῆc Ταντaλείαc (vide comm.)
fr. 456 1 ὠνητέραν δὴ *codd.*, ὀcιωτέραν δὴ Turnebus (teste Hubert), ὦ νέρτερ' Ἅιδη R. Porson, *Adversaria*, Cantabrigiae 1812, 315, fort. ὠνῆc πέρα δὴ Bernardakis, ὄναιτ' ἄρ' ἣν δὴ Munro 238, ἰδοὺ 'τέραν δὴ Blaydes 136, εὐνήτριαν δὴ Tucker 350, ὦ, νερτέραν δὴ? Mette[3] 152 (F 616), ὦ⟨ι⟩ νερτέραν δὴ? Mette[5] 161 (F 616) | δὴ om. *J S g a*[1] || **2** πληγὴν del. C. G. Cobet, *Variae Lectiones*..., Lugduni Batavorum 1854, 340

fr. 457 = 75 A

αἰδὼς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι γίγνεται, τέκνον

*fr. 458 = 76 A

(ΜΕΡ.) αἱ τύχαι δέ με
μισθὸν λαβοῦσαι τῶν ἐμῶν τὰ φίλτατα
σοφὴν ἔθηκαν

fr. 459 = 77 A

κέρδη τοιαῦτα χρή τινα κτᾶσθαι βροτῶν,
ἐφ' οἷσι μέλλει μήποθ' ὕστερον στένειν

fr. 457 Stob. 3, 31, 15 (3, 672, 1 Hense) Εὐριπίδου ἐκ Κρεσφόντου '...', ecl. hab. addito lemmate *S M* (post 3, 31, 14), sine lemm. cum ecl. 3, 31, 3 (= fr. 436) coniunctam *L* (κρησφον[τ] [η ex corr., sine acc.] *S*, κρησφόντου *M*)
***fr. 458** Plu. *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* 7, 90 a (1, 180, 2 Paton-Wegehaupt-Pohlenz) εἰ γὰρ ἕτεροι πράγμασιν ἀβουλήτοις περιπεσόντες διδάσκονται τὸ χρήσιμον, ὥσπερ ἡ Μερόπη φησίν '...', τί κωλύει διδάσκαλον ἄμισθον λαβόντα τὸν ἐχθρὸν ὠφεληθῆναι καὶ μαθεῖν τι τῶν λανθανόντων | ad *Cresphontem* rettulit Barnes 2, 476
fr. 459 Stob. 4, 31[d], 95 (5, 768, 11 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Κρεσφόντηι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (κρεσφόντη *M*, ecl. 93-99 + 102 lemmate Εὐρ. comprendit *S*)

fr. 457 ἐν: δ'ἐν *Tr.*, fort. recte | γίγνεται: φαίνεται scripserit Nauck, αἰδὼς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι, πρὸς δὲ κάρδιαν / ⟨ὦ⟩ τέκνον, οὐ βέβηκεν Snell p. [1033] Paroem. Laur. 80, 13 huc referens
fr. 459 1 χρή τινα *A Tr.*, χρη τινα sine acc., χ ex τι *S*[1], χρή τινὰ *M*, χρηστὰ πάσασθαι βροτῶι F. W. Schmidt 2, 470, πάντα χρὴ κτᾶσθαι βροτῶν K. Busche, RhM 55, 1900, 301, τινα κτᾶσθαι βροτόν Walker[1] 21

COMMENTARY

*test. 1

This passage contains an invective against the actor Aeschines, who is often scorned by Demosthenes as a τριταγωνιστής (cf. Wankel on D. 18, 129 [p. 699]) and may be used as evidence for a reproduction of the *Kresphontes* in IV B.C. In itself such a reproduction would be very well conceivable, as since 386 B.C. 'old' plays were occasionally reproduced at the City Dionysia (and since 341 B.C. regularly; cf. Pickard-Cambridge 99 f.; on reproductions of plays of Euripides also Schmid *GGL* I 3, 828).

Yet there would be a few problems if the passage had to refer to the *Kresphontes*:

(1) a minor problem is that Kresphontes in our play was probably the protagonist (cf. intr. 3.1 on the dramatic sigla in *POxy.* 27, 2458). But cf. on this problem Wankel ad loc. (p. 892), who, with a reference to Wilamowitz, stated "die verfestigte Diabole des Gegners als eines Tritagonisten ist kein Beweis dafür, dass Aisch. nur mindere Rollen spielte" and pointed out that Kreon also (in S. *Ant.*, as is apparent from D. 19, 246) was probably not played by the tritagonist (cf. also Radt on S. T 44; survey of views on Kreon in A. D. Fitton Brown, *Greek Plays as first Productions*, Leicester 1970, 9 and 21 n. 5);

(2) a more serious difficulty is that it would seem rather odd if Demosthenes were using a character like young Kresphontes, whose role in the *Kresphontes* obviously was a sympathetic and successful one, in the company of kings and tyrants who were quite the opposite and adduced in a passage on Aeschines' incompetence (on the context of this test. cf. Wankel ad loc. [p. 891]: "Der lispelnde Βάτταλος hat — nicht zuletzt mit seiner eben zitierten Rede — damals das Vaterland gerettet, während der tragische "Held" der Bühne versagt hat".). One should therefore bear in mind the possibility that Κρεσφόντην does not refer to the Kresphontes of our play, but to his father, who may have been a character in one of the other Heraclid plays of Euripides (so Cengarle 76; cf. also comm. on fr. 450), or that Blass ad loc. was right when he suggested that Demosthenes really meant Polyphontes instead of Kresphontes; cf. also Fitton Brown o.c. 22 n. 7, who reads Πολυφόντην and regards Κρεσφόντην as "due to dittography of Κρε-".

Especially because of (2) I would be hesitant to use this passage as evidence for a reproduction of the *Kresphontes*.

*test. 2

If we must read Μερόπην with Valckenaer, this passage might be a piece of evidence for reproduction of the *Kresphontes* in IV B.C. But there is no reason why Ἀερόπην should not be right: she was a character in Euripides' *Kressai* (fr. 460-70) and an *Aerope* was written by Agathon (*TrGF* 1, 39 F 1) and by Carcinus II (*TrGF* 1, 70 F 1). Carcinus' *Aerope* apparently was famous (cf. *TrGF* 1, 70 F 1) and both Nauck (p. 797) and Snell (on *TrGF* 1, 70 F 1) keep Ἀερόπην in Aelian's text and tend to relate the passage to Carcinus' play. On Aerope's sadness cf. also app. 1 C 3. Besides, the same story about the actor Theodorus moving the tyrant of Pherai is told in Plu. *Pel.* 29, 9 f., 293 e-f and *De Alex. M. Fortuna* 1, 334 a, where the plays in question are *Troades* and *Hecuba* respectively.

*test. 3

Basedow 5 regards this passage on Nero's histrionic activities as an indication "quod eadem (sc. the *Kresphontes*) ne Philostrati quidem aetate ex scena quasi quodammodo exulavit". It looks, however, rather as if the examples here given by Philostratus are a reminiscence of D. 18, 180 + 19, 246 f. (he also mentions Kreon, a little earlier). If so, the passage does not justify any conclusions as to actual performances. Cf. also on test. 1.

test. 5

This story is generally regarded as a summary of the *Kresphontes* (cf. Musso[5] 69 n. 7) and there can be little doubt that this view is right: the story of how Merope attacked her own son is recorded for the *Kresphontes* in test. 8 and 9; cf. fr. 456 + context. Cengarle 63 n. 1 mentions as an additional argument that 12 f. *senex ... uenit* is "uno specifico riferimento a situazione tragica", but this argument does not carry much weight.

Still, when using this fabula for reconstruction purposes, one must be careful, as Hyginus, though telling us the 'story' of the *Kresphontes*, does not necessarily give an accurate account of the play. Cf. Zuntz 134 ff. on the so-called *Tales from Euripides*, i.e. hypotheses of the type found in e.g. *POxy.* 27, 2455, with which the fabulae of Hyginus show some similarity. These tales, according to Zuntz, "are not designed to introduce the reader to the plays", but "are meant as a substitute for the plays" (p. 135); cf. also R. Hamilton, AJPh 97, 1976, 67-70; Budé 97-119. Besides, as the story of Kresphontes has elements in common with the Orestes-myth (see intr. 2.4), we must be aware of the danger of contamination (it may be instructive here to compare the highly contaminated *fab.* 119).

As to the text, we find the main part of the story (test. 5^{b}) in *fab.* $184^{ex.}$,

which is in *F* attached to *fab.* 184 *Pentheus et Agaue* (cf. Rose on *fab.* 137). Rose has connected the two into one fabula (cf. his intr. p. xv f.). I followed him in printing *fab.* 184$^{ex.}$ after *fab.* 137, but it is still a matter of uncertainty whether both pieces are actually part of the same fabula. It was argued that they were by M. Schmidt (intr. p. v f.), who suggested that there was originally one fabula, written in such a way that the left-hand page in a codex ended with 2 *possedit* and the right-hand page began with 3 *filium*. When this codex was bound, the pages containing *fab.* 138-184$^{in.}$ got in between, thereby splitting up *fab.* 137; subsequently someone adapted the second part of 137 to the last words of 184$^{in.}$ on the 'new' left-hand page *Lycotherses excepit* by adding 3 *cum* ... *occupauit* and 4 *quem* ... *habebat*, and this resulted in the state of affairs presented by *F*. Accordingly Schmidt deleted *cum* ... *occupauit* and *quem* ... *habebat* and made 137 and 184$^{ex.}$ into one fabula again.

If one does not accept Schmidt's theory of the wrong binding at some stage of the tradition and his deletions, it is hard to see how *fab.* 137 and 184$^{ex.}$ can be part of the same fabula: (1) 3 *cum quo* ... *occupauit* cannot be logically connected with 137; in fact it looks like part of a more detailed account of Polyphontes' doings in the past, in which perhaps something was told about an accomplice, (2) 1-2 *Polyphontes* ... *possedit*, though complete in itself (cf. also Musso[5] 69 "... il Fr. A ha tutta l'aria di essere una notizia scoliastica su Polifonte"), is rather scrappy and lacks a reference to the killing of the sons, which is taken for granted in 8 *patris et fratrum mortem* (a difficulty also noticed by Schmidt and Rose, see their app. crit.), (3) there seems to be no way to account for the 'splitting' of the fabula.

One would then have to accept the idea that *fab.* 137 is a short note on Polyphontes and *fab.* 184$^{ex.}$ a more elaborate, but acephalous version of the same story. So Basedow 6 ff., Musso[5] 67 ff. with various supplements to provide 184$^{ex.}$ with a beginning: *⟨Cresphontes Aristomachi filius [Polyphontis frater] uxorem duxerat Meropen [Cypseli filiam]⟩ cum qua* Basedow 8 (but, even if we had to read *qua* instead of *quo*, this can hardly be expected to refer to Merope, who certainly was not Polyphontes' accomplice; cf. already Bothe 155), *⟨Cresphontes, Messeniae rex, interfectus est a fratre Polyphonte cum duobus filiis, genitis a Merope uxore⟩, cum qua* Musso[5] 68 n. 2. A drawback of this solution is that it does not explain how *fab.* 184$^{ex.}$ ever became acephalous and attached to 184$^{in.}$.

If one compares the testimonia it is at once apparent that Hyginus' account is the most elaborate. For details of the story of the murder of Kresphontes Sr., however, which is only shortly dealt with in 1-2, we are dependent on the other testimonia: (1) motives of Polyphontes: cf. test. 7, 5 + comm., (2) relation between Polyphontes and Kresphontes Sr.: cf. test. 6, 3 + comm., (3) killing of the sons: cf. test. 6, 1 f. + comm., (4) marriage with Merope, on which 2 *Meropen uxorem possedit* is not very explicit: cf. test. 6, 4

+ comm. 3ff. are fairly detailed and there seems to be only one point in which one of the other testimonia has something to add, i.e. 19f., where the killing of Polyphontes is related: here test. 7, 8f. gives some gruesome details, but we have no means of verifying whether these details are Euripidean. On two points the other testimonia differ from Hyginus: (1) the place where young Kresphontes was hidden, see comm. on 5 *in Aetoliam*, (2) the name of young Kresphontes, see comm. on 10 *Telephontem*.

1-2 Polyphontes ... possedit: this Polyphontes, who reminds us of Aigisthos, is only attested in connection with the *Kresphontes*, and it is generally assumed that Euripides 'invented' him for this play; but cf. intr. 2.1. From the account of Hyginus and some of the other testimonia and fragments we may gather that he was represented as a typical tyrant: (1) he came to power by killing the king (cf. also fr. 66, 20ff. A; test. 5; 6 and 7), like Lykos (*HF* 31 ff.) and in a somewhat different way Aigisthos, (2) he forced Merope to be his wife (cf. test. 6, 4 and comm.), (3) apparently he was afraid of being killed himself (cf. 5f. *hunc ... necasset*; and fr. 66, 13f. A on his behaviour towards strangers), a feature which reminds us of the kind of fear which is typical of tyrants; cf. *Su.* 444ff. (and Collard ad loc.), *HF* 166ff. (fear of revenging offspring in 546f.), *Ion* 626ff., *El.* 25ff., S. *OT* 584ff. and Sen. *HF* 341 f. *rapta sed trepida manu / sceptra obtinentur*. On this type of tyrants in Euripides cf. W. Nauhardt, *Das Bild des Herrschers in der griechischen Dichtung*, Berlin 1940, 71ff.; Bengl 77ff.; Dodds on Pl. *Grg.* 510 b 9-c 5 and *Su.* 429-55 with Collard's notes.

Cresphontem ... filium: the well-known Heraclid, who became king of Messenia by treachery, when he and the other Heraclids were casting lots about the division of the Peloponnese; cf. Robert[2] 2, 662; Prinz 309ff. On Kresphontes Sr. being killed cf. also the prose-accounts mentioned in intr. 2.1.

Meropen: like Kresphontes (see below on 3 *filium ... mandauit*) and Polyphontes we find this Merope only in connection with Euripides' *Kresphontes*. Cf. Stoll in Roscher II 2, 2839 s.v. Merope (6) (he mentions 12 other Meropes as well). If we compare the *Kresphontes* with the Orestes-myth (cf. intr. 2.1 and 2.4), Merope, like Elektra, represents the elements of the faithful relative at home, pining for the return of the avenging hero and helping him when he has arrived. Formally her position as wife of the usurper and mother of the returning son resembles that of Klytaimestra.

3 ... cum quo: if the text is sound (but see intr. above) this suggests an accomplice of Polyphontes, but no other source tells us anything about such a person. Yet, as this part of the fabula clearly refers to the 'past' it is possible that this person was only mentioned in the prologue of our play, without being of importance for the rest of the play. (Vysoký 10 [summary 20] argues that Merope's father Kypselos sided with Polyphontes [comparing Enn.

fr. LIII], but [1] Enn. fr. LIII cannot be used as evidence for the *Kresphontes* [see intr. 1.4], [2] fr. 66, 30 A suggests that Merope's father was taking part in the rescuing of young Kresphontes).

3-5 filium ... mandauit: the way in which the youngest child is smuggled out of the country while his father and brothers are killed is another feature which recalls stories like the myth of Orestes. We do not find this young Kresphontes mentioned in Greek literature except in connection with Euripides' play (cf. Stoll in Roscher II 1, 1421 s.v. Kresphontes [2]). As to his name there can be no doubt that the general view that in the *Kresphontes* he was called Kresphontes, after his father, is right: (1) this is the only name that accounts for the title of the play, (2) the name Kresphontes is given to him in test. 7 and 9 (which was rightly interpreted by Musgrave 3, 557) and if Barrett's interpretation of fr. 66, 34 f. A were right, we would be able to 'prove' it from the play itself (but see comm. ad loc.). Cf. also Basedow 10 ff., Wecklein 2, Cengarle 63 n. 1.

On the habit of calling sons after their father, which was comparatively rare in V B.C., cf. Ernst Fraenkel, *RE* 16, 1935, 1624 (s.v. Namenwesen); M. Sulzberger, REG 39, 1926, 419. In Euripides we have a parallel in *HF* 31, where Lykos is called after his father (on his 'invention' see Bond intr. *HF* XXVIII and on 31). The similarity of names may help to bring out a similarity of mind; cf. *Il.* 17, 720 ἶcον θυμὸν ἔχοντες ὁμώνυμοι, sc. both Ajaxes, and Eust. 1124, 29 ff. Still, our sources are not unanimous in calling the son Kresphontes: Hyginus seems to tell us that he was called Telephontes (see below on 10 *Telephontem*) and Apollodorus calls him Aipytos (see on test. 6, 5). Neither of these, however, can be defended on good grounds for the *Kresphontes*; for an explanation of how they got in at all see comm.

in Aetoliam: Hyginus and Apollodorus (test. 6, 5 f.) differ as to the place where Merope hid her son. It has been argued that Apollodorus, who let Merope give her child to her father, the Arcadian Kypselos (for details see comm.), was here influenced by the Messenian version of the story (cf. Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 31; Paus. 4, 3, 6-8), in which the connection with Arcadia became more important (cf. also intr. 2.1). Aetolia was defended by Basedow 25 and Vysoký 7, both arguing that it would be stupid — and therefore unlikely to be Euripidean — to hide the child in such an obvious place as his grandfather's home. But now fr. 66, 30 A μητρ[ὸ]ϲ [π]ατὴρ νιν[makes it probable that Apollodorus represents the Euripidean version after all, even though we cannot be sure about the details, because the line really tells us no more than that 'his mother's father' had something to do with the escape of Kresphontes. Aetolia in Hyginus may have crept in because of contamination with some version of the story of Orestes; cf. Hyg. *fab.* 119.

5-6 hunc ... necasset: like Aigisthos in *El.* 32 f. ὃc μὲν γῆc ἀπηλλάχθη φυγὰc / Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖc, χρυcὸν εἶφ' ὃc ἂν κτάνηι, Polyphontes promises

a reward to the man who kills the hidden son. For a comparison of the use which is made of this motif in both plays see intr. 2.4.

8 patris et fratrum mortem: here the killing of Kresphontes' brothers, which is not mentioned in 1 f., is taken for granted. We now know from fr. 66, 24 A that the detail was indeed Euripidean. Cf. also test. 6, 1 f. and (less explicit) fr. 454, 455.

8-10 itaque ... Telephontem: the trick of announcing one's own death in similar circumstances is familiar from A. *Ch.* 674 ff. and S. *El.* 1098 ff. (cf. intr. 2.4), but the addition that Kresphontes presents himself as his own *murderer* and the frightful consequences of this announcement are an element not found elsewhere.

Telephontem: it is unlikely that we must infer from this that the son was called Telephontes in the *Kresphontes*; cf. the arguments adduced in favour of calling him Kresphontes on 3-5. These can, I think, be regarded as decisive. The simplest explanation of *Telephontem* seems to be that it is a mistake or aberration of Hyginus; cf. Rose ad loc.: "aut in nomine Telephontis peccavit librarius aut ita Euripidem secutus est noster ut levibus quibusdam rebus ab eo dissentiat" (both possibilities are also mentioned by Cengarle 63 n. 1). As to the idea that *Telephontem* was a corruption cf. D. A. van Krevelen, Phil. 112, 1968, 269-275 (who observes that wrong transcriptions in Micyllus' *editio princeps* [*F*] as compared to the fragments of the ms. [*Φ*] are common because Micyllus could hardly read *Φ* and used a bad contemporary copy of it; example of a corrupt proper name on p. 274); Musso[5] 68 f. On conscious variations or aberrations in Hyginus cf. Zuntz 136 n. 3.

Another explanation, which I think is less likely, is that Telephontes was a false (and significant) name, used by Kresphontes when he came back in disguise; so Lessing 412, K. Schwenk, RhM 2, 1843, 456, Basedow 10 f., Schmid *GGL* I 3, 395 f. If one accepts this idea, however, it is necessary to change the text accordingly, as did Robert[2] 2, 672 n. 1: *dicens se Telephontem ⟨esse et⟩ Cresphontis interfecisse filium et Meropes.* Perhaps one could compare the false announcements of identity in A. *Ch.* 674 and S. *El.* 45, 670, 1106 f.; but these are not false *names*. Welcker simply calls Merope's son Telephontes, regarding Κρεcφόντηι in test. 9 as a mistake (2, 835), but that is untenable.

10 in hospitio: on the difficulty of Kresphontes' whereabouts during the following scenes, especially when Merope is going to attack him with her axe, and the exact nature of the *hospitium*, called *chalcidicum* in 14 f., see intr. to fr. 456. For the motif of sending a stranger to the guestrooms cf. A. *Ch.* 712 (Klyt.:) ἄγ' αὐτὸν (sc. Orestem) εἰc ἀνδρῶναc εὐξένουc δόμων, E. Alc. 543 ff.

12-13 senex ... comparere: from the account of Hyginus we may gather that the *senex* was one of those old faithful servants whom we find more often in Euripides (so in *El.*, *Ion*, *IA*; cf. also the old shepherd in the *Antiope* and

the paidagogos in *Ph.*). This type of servant, which is already represented by characters like Eumaios in the *Odyssey* has been developed in tragedy especially by Euripides (but a good example is also the old man in S. *El.*). They are very loyal to their masters and their home and usually old, so as to stress the long intimacy with their people: they may be the paidagogos of the former generation (so *El.* 287, 487 f., *Ion* 725 f.) or a gift from the old home of their mistress (so *IA* 46 ff.). Cf. Ahlers 7 ff.; 51 ff. (56-58 on our *senex*); Brandt 21 ff. On the question whether the *senex* too recalls a character from the Orestes-myth see intr. 2.5. The announcement of the *senex* that Kresphontes had disappeared would seem to confirm the story told by the stranger; for a comparable double announcement of the death of Orestes cf. S. *El.* 660 ff. and 1098 ff. (for details see intr. 2.4).

13-14 Merope ... dormiebat: we do not know whether Merope inferred this merely from the presence of a stranger in combination with the story of the *senex*. It is also conceivable that she had already been informed about the arrival of her son's murderer, but not been inclined to believe it altogether until the arrival of the *senex* with the fatal message. This latter possibility seems to me to give a more coherent sequence of events and increase of emotions.

14 f. in chalcidicum: see on 10 *in hospitio*.

15 cum ... interficeret: on this famous scene see intr. to fr. 456.

17-18 redit ... gratiam: the expedient of a mock-reconciliation or appearance of submissiveness in order to carry out one's plans of revenge or escape is used by Euripides in several of his plays; cf. e.g. *Med.* 774 ff., *Hec.* 968 ff., *Hel.* 1193 ff.

18-19 rex ... interfecit: the way in which Polyphontes is killed again recalls the *Elektra*: in *El.* 774 ff. Aigisthos too is killed at a sacrifice (see intr. 2.4). For 'details' of the killing of Polyphontes see test. 7, 8 f. + comm. Langholf 104 f. notices that Euripides was very fond of having people killed when they are praying or sacrificing (cf. e.g. *Andr.* 1111 ff. [Neoptolemos], *HF* 922 ff. [Herakles' family] etc.) Cf. also the mechanemata in *El.* 998 ff., *IT* 1153 ff., *Hel.* 1193 ff., where the victims are deceived by a claim that some ritual has to be performed (cf. S. Jaekel, Arctos 11, 1977, 26).

test. 6

Though more compact than test. 5 this passage too must be taken to give the contents of the *Kresphontes*. In a few points it adds details which are not found in Hyginus (cf. intr. test. 5 and comm. below). On the sources of Apollodorus cf. C. Robert, *De Apollodori Bibliotheca*, Diss. Berlin 1873, 49 ff.; on the summaries of Euripidean plays in the *Bibl.* o.c. 82 f.; also E. Schwartz, *RE* 1, 1894, 2878 ff. (s.v. Apollodoros [61]); B. Zühlke, Phil. 105, 1961, 8 + n. 3; Budé 86 and 109 f.

1-2 μετὰ δύο παίδων φονευθείς: for this detail see comm. on test. 5, 8.

3 καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ὑπάρχων: that this detail is Euripidean could already be inferred from Gell. *NA* 6, 3, 28 (quoted as context of fr. 451) and is now confirmed by fr. 66, 16 ff. A. For further details on Polyphontes as a Heraclid see intr. 2.1 and intr. to fr. 451.

3-4 τὴν ... ἔλαβεν: test. 5, 2 *Meropen uxorem possedit* is not very explicit about the marriage, but in this passage it is clearly stated that Polyphontes took Merope against her will (cf. also test. 7, 5); perhaps fr. 66, 40 ff. A also contains some information about this marriage, but the lines are badly mutilated and no firm conclusions can be drawn.

The motif of a king trying to force someone to marry him we find already in the *Diktys* (cf. Nauck p. 459 f.) and later in Theoklymenos' attempts to marry Helen; Seneca introduced it into his *HF*, where Lycus tries to make Megara marry him, but is refused (332-523). Cf. also Σ Lyc. 38 Λύκου βασιλεύοντος ... καὶ βιαζομένου τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (sc. Herakles' wife Megara). These passages would have made us expect the same motif in E. *HF* if we had not known better; cf. Wilamowitz[2] 2, 161 n. 75, who suggests that Seneca actually took this motif from the *Kresphontes*.

5 καλούμενον Αἴπυτον: another name for Merope's son (cf. comm. on test. 5, 3-5 and 8-10), but one that can be easily explained. It has been argued convincingly that this name, which is also found in Paus. 4, 3, 8, is part of the modifications made in the story of Kresphontes when in IV B.C. Messenia linked itself more closely with Arcadia: the story was then adapted to form the 'ancient history' of Messenia and the connection with Arcadia was stressed by calling the son of Kresphontes Sr. Aipytos, ancestor of the Aipytidai and deriving his name from the old Arcadian hero Aipytos (on whom see Wentzel, *RE* 1, 1894, 1045 s.v. Aipytos [2]). Cf. Niese 11 f., E. Schwartz, Hermes 34, 1899, 449 f., Robert[2] 2, 673, Nilsson[2] 77; intr. 2.1 + n. 4. Apollodorus, who in other respects seems to follow Euripides' version of the story, here seems to be influenced by the later version of the myth. Cf. Niese 12 n. 1. Wentzel o.c. s.v. Aipytos (4) and Schmid *GGL* I 3, 395 n. 6 take Aipytos to be the older name, which was subsequently changed by Euripides into Kresphontes, but they offer no arguments.

5-6 ἔδωκε ... τρέφειν: it is now very probable, because of fr. 66, 30 A μητρ[ὸ]ς [π]ατὴρ νιν[that Apollodorus follows Euripides here (cf. on test. 5, 3-5). This grandfather we know from other sources as Kypselos, the king of Arcadia (cf. Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 31, Paus. 4, 3, 6-8). Now that it has been established that Merope's father played a part in the rescuing of Kresphontes, one may wonder how much of Euripides' version is reflected in the details given by Pausanias and in the elaborate story of Nicolaus (see intr. 2.1): the motif of the child happening to be away at the time, which both use, is certainly old and may be used by Euripides too; cf. Hes. fr. 35, 4 ff. about

Nestor. On the motif of special relations between boys and their maternal grandfather see J. Bremmer, ZPE 50, 1983, 173-186 (on boys being raised by their maternal grandfather [e.g. Iphidamas in *Il.* 11, 221 ff.] esp. p. 174).

test. 7

A.P. 3 contains 19 epigrams, which describe the reliefs in a now destroyed temple in Kyzikos, which was dedicated to Apollonis (the wife of Attalus I) by her sons Attalus and Eumenes; most of them contain examples of filial devotion, generally towards a mother. Cf. H. Meyer, *De Anthologiae Palatinae Epigrammatis Cyzicenis*, Diss. Regimonti 1911, who dates the temple between 159-149 B.C. and the epigrams and the preceding descriptions after IV A.D., perhaps in VI A.D. (cf. o.c. 2 and 70). Several of these epigrams reflect plays of Euripides, cf. Meyer o.c. 73 n. 1; and for a more detailed discussion of the relation of these epigrams to tragedy A. Calderini, *Degli Epigrammi Ciziceni considerati in relazione con la tragedia*, Athenaeum 1, 1913, 345-372.

As to the sources of the author of the epigrams: in the case of test. 7 it seems hard to maintain that he based himself exclusively on the reliefs or a description. First of all it should be noticed that the epigram adds several details which are not in the preceding description: (1) 5 Polyphontes' relation with Merope, (2) 6 details of Kresphontes' return, (3) 8 f. details of the killing. Now some details may have been provided because the author actually saw the temple or had access to a more elaborate description (on the question whether the author saw the temple himself or merely read a description see Meyer o.c. 70): this would account for the information given in 8 f., but it is hard to see how the reliefs themselves or a description could convey the background-information given in 5 and 6. So it seems likely that the author had another source of information as well. That is, he may have found his background-information in some collection of fabulae or a mythological handbook, now lost to us (none of the other testimonia gives us the details of 5) or alternatively he may have known the *Kresphontes* (this idea is defended by Calderini o.c. 349 and 371 f.).

2-3 *If* these details (for which cf. also 8-9) go back on the *Kresphontes*, we may infer from it that Merope took an active part in the killing of Polyphontes—a detail which is not in Hyginus, but would certainly fit in with the violence she displayed earlier in the play (in her attack with the axe). One may perhaps compare the way in which Elektra helps Orestes to kill Klytaimestra (*El.* 1224 f., *Or.* 1235) and the fearful revenges of which other Euripidean women like Hekabe and Medea were capable.

3 ἐκδικίαν: I have accepted Boissonade's ἐκδικίαν, because it gives a better sense than ἐκδημίαν: if ἐκδημίαν means 'death' here (cf. LSJ s.v. 3,

who mention only this passage), cυνεργοῦcα—ἐκδημίαν would mean that Merope helped to kill her husband (it seems preposterous to let τοῦ ἄνδροc refer to Polyphontes). Obviously this is not what the context demands: what we want is something like 'helping with the revenge for her husband' and this can be effected quite simply by accepting ἐκδικίαν (confusion of ι/η and κ/μ is of course common in mss.: some references on κ/μ in Diggle 1).

5 λέκτρα θέλων βιάcαι: with these words (I have accepted Stadtmueller's βιάcαι for the impossible μιάναι) one of the reasons for Polyphontes' crime seems to be given (cf. Calderini o.c. 358 "nell' epigramma ciziceno si insiste intorno al carattere passionale del delitto di Polifonte"). The fragments and other testimonia neither confirm nor contradict this. Polyphontes' motives are dealt with in fr. 66, 22 A βίαι δολώcαc, ὡc τυραννεύοι χθονόc and fr. 451 and 452 (Polyphontes claiming that his reason was self-defence; cf. perhaps also fr. 459. But it may well be that his desire to have Merope was mentioned elsewhere in the play.

8-9 δόρυ πῆξε μεταφρένωι: the attack from behind recalls the way in which Orestes kills Aigisthos at the sacrifice (*El.* 839 ff.). Bergmann 144 notices that Euripides apparently used a motif from *Od.* 11, 410 ff., where Aigisthos invites Agamemnon to a meal and then kills him from behind οἶκονδε καλέccαc, / δειπνίccαc, ὥc τίc τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνηι. The use of a spear and the assistance of Merope with a 'heavy stick', however, suggest that some of the details of the killing must have been different from the story in *El.* 774 ff. (where Orestes uses a sacrificial knife and acts without the assistance of Elektra).

POxy. 27, 2458 = fr. 66 A

fr. 1

Turner[1] 75 argued convincingly that fr. 1 is from the prologue of the *Kresphontes*: "That fr. 1 col. II comes early in the play is clear from the circumstantial nature of the questions and answers, which could hardly have been drawn out to such a length if the audience were familiar with the situation. Before the action begins the audience must of course learn Cresphontes' real identity, while the chorus and Merope must not know it. Cresphontes must therefore have made himself known to the audience, presumably in a monologue, before the chorus entered. The present scene could be a second portion of the prologue". I think there can be little doubt that these observations are right, and they have in fact been almost generally accepted. An exception is Mette[1] 394, who adduced two arguments for rejecting Turner's view: (1) he believed that 61 ὑμεῖc was addressed to the chorus and inferred from this that the chorus must therefore have appeared

on the stage before fr. 1 col. I (Mette[5] 158 and 162 still believes in the presence of the chorus during this scene), (2) "allem Anschein nach ist der Sprecher β, etwa Merope, schon vor Beginn der neuen Bruchstücke aufgetreten: wenn diese Bezeichnungen nicht auf Prot-, Deuter- und Tritagonisten gehen". Both arguments are easily refuted: ὑμεῖϲ can well be interpreted as a new group of gods to which Kresphontes is directing his prayers (see comm. on 61), whereas the dramatic sigla are almost certainly referring to the protagonist etc. (cf. intr. 3.1).

If we assume that fr. 1 is from the prologue, the remains suggest the following structure of this prologue: (1) monologue (remains in fr. 1 col. I); (2) dialogue of Kresphontes and a person who tells him about the situation in the palace (fr. 1 col. II; probably also fr. 3 and fr. 2 col. I and fr. 1 col. III 1-4); (3) monologue by Kresphontes (fr. 1 col. III 5 ff. and probably also fr. 2 col. II 1-2). For details see comm. on 1 ff., 13 ff., 32 ff., 39 ff., 48 ff., 68 ff. The prologue would then have a structure which is similar to that of *Andr.*, *Hel.* (twice) and *Or.* Especially the situation of the so-called second prologue of *Hel.* shows much similarity: 386-434 monologue of Menelaos, who explains the situation he is in (cf. our 1-8?); 435-482 dialogue with the gate-keeper, who wants to get Menelaos off the premises, because her master is hostile to all Greeks (cf. 13 ff.; especially 13 f. suggest that Polyphontes was equally reluctant to admit strangers), offers some information (though less detailed than our γ̄, obviously because it is further on in the play) and at the end of the dialogue once again urges Menelaos to go away (476 ff.; cf. perhaps our 46 f. and comm. ad loc.); 483-514 another monologue by Menelaos, who at first does not know what to do or say (483 τί φῶ; τί λέξω; cf. our 52 f.) and then takes a decision (505 δόμων ἄνακτα προϲμενῶ, cf. our 54 f.?). These similarities were also noticed by Burnett 19. For this type of prologue cf. also Nestle[2] 83, Imhof[1] 23, H. W. Schmidt in Jens 3 ff. (survey of the various structures).

fr. 1 col. I

1-2 Although there are no lines of which more than 8 letters are preserved, and the text offers very little indications as to the contents of the lines, we still have good reasons to believe that this column is from a monologue: (1) all the preserved plays of Euripides begin with a monologue (cf. H. W. Schmidt in Jens 5.; an exception may be the anapaestic beginning of *IA* [if it is by Euripides; cf. on this problem recently D. Bain, CQ 27, 1977, 10-26]; cf. also fr. 114-115 from the prologue of the *Andromeda*), (2) in 13 the dialogue still seems to be in a fairly early stage: perhaps only a few introductory lines have preceded, as the question in 13 looks very much like a reaction to an attempt of γ̄ to send the stranger away (cf. *Hel.* 437 ff.); also the following questions

are still of a very general character, really the sort of thing one asks first on arrival. I suppose, therefore, that only the lower part of col. I was part of the dialogue, whereas the upper part was still part of the prologue-rhesis. This is supported by the references to πατὴρ in 5 and τ]έκνα in 12, which suggest that the story of the murder is dealt with in these lines: it is obvious that this cannot be part of the same dialogue as 20 ff.

Presumably the prologue-rhesis occupied fr. 1 col. I + a column preceding it: (1) although there are examples of short initial monologues (e.g. *Alc.* with 27 lines and *Stheneboia* with 31 lines [but cf. D. Korzeniewski, Phil. 108, 1964, 45-65]) the average length appears to be about 50 lines; this may not be decisive, but it is supported by the remains of the text, (2) 1] τειν δ' ε[ ]ω is unlikely to be from the first line of the play (see comm. ad loc.).

The possibilities as to the speaker of the prologue-rhesis are limited because in 13 ff. Kresphontes is one of the speakers: his identity must by then be known to the audience. Therefore γ̄ (who calls him ξένε in 16) as well as Merope and Polyphontes must be excluded: they cannot tell us that the stranger is Kresphontes. Other arguments against them could be added: Polyphontes is unlikely because he is the villain of the play; cf. Méridier 70: "Dans tous ces drames [sc. where the prologue-rhesis is spoken by a mortal] le prologue est dit par un personnage appartenant au parti opprimé ou qui s'y range lui-même en qualité de protecteur", a 'sympathetic' prologue-speaker of course being an effective means of directing the audience's sympathy; cf. also Grube 67. Merope, on the other hand, would be less suitable because of being too much emotionally involved: it would be unlike Euripides to have the, as a rule rather matter of fact, account of the prologue-rhesis spoken by a character which carried so much of the pathos of the play; see also below. The *senex* cannot have spoken the prologue-rhesis because of test. 5, 12 f. *senex qui inter matrem et filium internuntius erat flens ad Meropen uenit, negans eum apud hospitem esse nec comparere*: this would be inconceivable after a monologue in which he helped to make Kresphontes known to the audience.

Supposing that we know all the *dramatis personae*, I can see only two other candidates: Kresphontes himself or a god. A god, however, does not seem very likely, because it is very hard to see what reason Euripides could have had here to let a god speak the monologue. If a god speaks the prologue-rhesis there are usually good reasons for it (e.g. in *Hipp.* Aphrodite is the only character who knows all about the situation *and* is able to tell it; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 1-57; in *Tr.* the prologue informs us about the future of the Greek army, which naturally is known only to the gods; cf. Méridier 73 ff.). No such reasons seem to exist for the *Kresphontes.* Therefore Kresphontes himself has been regarded as the most suitable candidate (cf. e.g. Turner[1] 75, Musso[6] 30). On the whole it is not very common for Euripides to have the prologue-rhesis

spoken by the protagonist (cf. Méridier 71, H. W. Schmidt in Jens 10f., 34f.), apparently because he preferred to keep this part of the play free from pathos. Exceptions among the preserved plays are only *Andr.* and *Hel.*, where the position of the heroine as a suppliant at the altar explains why Euripides let her speak the initial monologue, and *IT*, where it can be explained by the demand for a double exposition of the partners for the anagnorisis. Among the lost plays we may compare *Hyps.* (cf. Bond 7ff.), and, more important, because the protagonists in these plays were also heroes coming from afar, *Telephos* (fr. 102 Austin) and *Archelaos* (see intr. to fr. 228).

If Kresphontes spoke the prologue-rhesis, elements in his rhesis must have been: an indication of his identity, of the scene of the action, an exposition of the present situation and probably also of the events of the past. For a detailed survey of the elements of Euripidean prologue-rheseis cf. Méridier 13-67.

A few ideas which must certainly be rejected are:

(1) Welcker 2, 831: the prologue-rhesis was spoken by the ghost of Kresphontes Sr. Welcker got this idea because of test. 1, where it is implied that Aeschines played Kresphontes as a tritagonist and because he believed that no 'living' Kresphontes appeared in the play. But see comm. on test. 1 for a rejection of the first argument; the second is obviously obsolete (cf. already Wecklein 2). For a rejection of Welcker's idea cf. also K. Schwenk RhM 2, 1843, 456.

(2) Mette[1] 394: col. I "gehört dem jungen, soeben aus der Fremde heimgekehrten Kresphontes, der (in monologischer Rede) das Reich seines Vaters von dem Usurpator Polyphontes fordert". This fits in with his idea that fr. 1 is not from the prologue, which I have rejected above, and must therefore be rejected too. Besides, I absolutely fail to see how this particular interpretation ('Kresphontes asking back his kingdom from Polyphontes') can be got out of the scanty remains of col. I (even if Mette's αἰ]τεῖν in 1 were right, we have no reason to suppose that the asking was for a kingdom).

(3) Musgrave 3, 558 and others: fr. 1083 is part of the prologue of the *Kresphontes*. For a rejection of this idea see appendix 1 B 5.

For a possible objection to Kresphontes as speaker of the monologue see comm. on 13ff.

1] ̣τειν: inf. of a verb in -τέω or -τω. Mette's αἰ]τεῖν is just one of many possibilities.

ε̣[̣]ω: there is a tear in the papyrus and it is hard to see how much room there may have been between ε̣ and ω; γ would fit, but ἔ̣[χ]ω seems possible too (for inf. + ἔχω at the end of a trimeter cf. e.g. *Med.* 465, *Heracl.* 485); there seems to be too much room for ἔ̣[c]ω. As to the division of the letters,]τειν δ ε̣[̣]ω seems to be the only possibility. This makes it unlikely that fr. 1 col. I was the beginning of the *Kresphontes*: δέ in the first line of a play seems

intractable and I have found no instance of a play of which the first line contains δέ. (An exception may be Ezechiel *TrGF* 1, 128, 1 ἀφ' οὗ δ' Ἰακὼβ γῆν λιπὼν Χαναναίαν [cf. H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, Cambridge 1983, 70, who adds some general remarks on δέ in first lines]; I have not taken into account the beginning of *Mel. Sophe* as given in *POxy*. 27, 2455 fr. 1 + 2 Ζεὺς δε̣[, on which see Austin 90).

2]ν̣νικηc: if my]ν̣ is the right reading the only supplement I can think of is τυρα]ν̣νικῆc. This word is found 11 × in Euripides and would fit the presumed context (it is used of a palace 7 × ; e.g. *Hel.* 1170 δόμουc τυραννικούc, *Andr.* 882 τυραννικαὶ cτέγαι). It is quite conceivable that in the prologue the royal palace in front of which the action took place was mentioned. Elsewhere we find the adj. with λῆμα (*Med.* 348), θρόνουc (*Ion* 1572), [c]κ[ή]πτρωι (*Antiop.* 17 [Page *GLP* 1, 64]). If]η̣νικηc is the right reading (which cannot be altogether excluded), Ἑλλ]η̣νικῆc is one of the few possibilities.

3].ονοc: the first letter is too badly damaged to supply anything with certainty. If it was μ or ν, one may think of a gen. sg., or one may consider] μ̣όνοc (so Musso[6] ad loc. who suggests e.g. ἐγὼ δ' ἐcώθην τῶν καcιγνήτων] μόνοc; cf. *Ion* 279).

5 If Kresphontes is speaking here (see above), he may well be speaking about Kresphontes Sr. (ἐμὸc] πατήρ?).

6].ὕπο: Musso[6] ad loc. remarks: "Mi sembra che si possa congetturare γῆc] ὕπο, con riferimento a πατήρ del verso precedente. Cresfonte verrebbe a dire che il padre è morto", comparing *HF* 1247.]c̣, however, is excluded by the trace before ὕπο. Besides, there is nothing to suggest that Kresphontes is here speaking about his father's *death*. He may be doing so, but we cannot be sure. If]ν̣ is right, one could perhaps think about a gen. pl. before ὕπο.

7]λ̣ικον: the possibilities to supply this are limited: ἡ]λ̣ίκον, πη]λ̣ίκον, τη]λ̣ίκον are metrically possible, but not otherwise attested in Euripides. Even so, a remark about somebody's age seems conceivable in a story of the murder (another possibility would have been Αἰτω]λ̣ικόν: cf. test. 5, 5 *ad hospitem in Aetoliam mandauit*; but this is now unlikely because of the new reading of 30 [where see comm.]).

8].ροc: if]τ̣ is right, πα]τ̣ρόc seems the only possibility; but the traces are too vague to be certain.

12 τ]έκνα: about this supplement there can be little doubt and the brothers of Kresphontes spring to mind. If the columnheight was ± 37 lines, there would be ± 25 lines lost between this line and fr. 1 col. II 1 (cf. intr. 3.1).

fr. 1 col. II

13-31 Col. II contains a stichomythia of which the speakers are indicated in

the papyrus by ᾱ and γ̄ (on this type of dramatic sigla see intr. 3.1). ᾱ is addressed in 16 as ξένε and is asking the kind of questions a stranger would ask: that this stranger must be young Kresphontes is generally accepted. The identity of γ̄ is more difficult to find out, as the text offers little help: it shows only that he (or she, but I shall call γ̄ 'him' for the sake of convenience) is well-informed about the situation in the palace; his answers (especially in 14 and 22) suggest that he sympathizes with Merope. Yet, it seems worthwhile to discuss the possibilities.

None of the *dramatis personae* whom we know can be identified with γ̄: Polyphontes can be excluded straightaway; Merope has been suggested by Turner[1] 75: "... there would be sharp irony if his informant were his mother. The sentiments expressed are consistent with her sympathies and knowledge". If so, we would have a parallel in *Ion* 237ff., where Kreusa and Ion are talking together without knowing each other (cf. Hourmouziades 106 n. 1), but, quite apart from the fact that the tone of the answers is very business-like so that one can hardly believe them to be spoken by the bereaved mother (cf. e.g. 24), μητρ[ὸ]ς [π]ατὴρ in 30 strongly suggests that the speaker is *not* this mother (unless, of course, she were deliberately hiding her identity, but then there seems to be little point in doing so in front of one's own palace); for objections against the idea that γ̄ = Merope cf. also Webster 138. Lloyd-Jones[1] 446 and Austin 42 (but cf. intr. 3.1) suggested that γ̄ = γέρων, but this is based on a false interpretation of the dramatic sigla and does not fit in with the fact that the old man knew Kresphontes (test. 5, 12ff.; Plu. *De esu carn.* 2, 5, 998 e [see fr. 456]); cf. also the objections of Mette[1] 394, Musso[4] 63f., Lens 256.

Now two possibilities remain: (1) γ̄ is a *dramatis persona* who is not mentioned by Hyginus (we have no reason to assume that he mentions *all* the dramatis personae: cf. intr. *Arch.* 2.2), (2) γ̄ is a so-called πρόcωπον προτατικόν, which plays no part in the rest of the *Kresphontes*, but is used only here in order to help the exposition, like e.g. Teukros and the portress in *Hel.* (cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1-514 [p. 12]), the slave-woman in *Andr.* and Helen in *Or.*; cf. on such characters Nestle[2] 31. Here a πρόcωπον προτατικόν could be e.g. a member of the palace-staff (cf. Webster 140 "a friendly servant, male or female", Musso[6] 30 "una serva"): this would explain on the one hand why he is able to give detailed information, on the other hand why he met Kresphontes: he may have been a porter or portress or occupied outside for other reasons. There is, I think, no way to establish γ̄'s sex. Arguments have been proffered in favour of a woman, e.g. by Burnett 19 "unknown sex, though the apparent display of sympathy with Merope at lines 32-35 [= 48-51] suggests that it is a woman"; Musso[6] 30 "È'da pensare a una serva più che a un servo per via del pathos che il personaggio esprime e per il part. femm. κλαίουcα, che si legge al v. 39 di *Fr.* 2 C [= 51] (v. commento ai vv. 36-39), corris-

pondente a δακρυρροοῦcα di *Alc.* 137, riferito appunto a una serva che soffre per il destino della sua padrona Alcesti". But I cannot see any indications of 'female pathos' and κλαίουcα in 51 may just as well refer to Merope, or, if the lines are gnomic, to women in general.

The contents of the stichomythia are clear as far as 13 ff. are concerned; 32-38 may be, among other things, about the child's name (see comm.), whereas 39-51 seem to deal, partly at least, with Merope. It is hard to tell how much in this dialogue was a repetition of what had been told in the prologue-rhesis. One would expect that details about murder and escape had already been told in the monologue; perhaps, though, the latter part of the dialogue contained some new information about Merope, whereas also the fact that Polyphontes was inhospitable may have been new to Kresphontes (see also comm. on 48 ff.). On repetition later in the play of information which was already given in the prologue-rhesis cf. Schmid *GGL* I 3, 772 n. 5. But his examples are all from plays where the speaker leaves the stage after his speech without entering into conversation with one of the other characters in the play: this might be an argument against Kresphontes as speaker of the prologue-rhesis, as it would seem a little silly to hear him ask about the very things he had just told. Of the examples of repetitions given by Méridier 153 ff. none is longer than a few lines. On stichomythic scenes in Euripides see in general Schwinge passim (with references to older literature); Seidensticker in Jens 183-220; C. Collard, LCM 5, 1980, 77-85.

13 μ̣[ῶν: as μ̣[appears to account best for the traces in the papyrus, μ̣[ῶν is very likely to be right, this particle being exactly what we want here; cf. on the use of μῶν Barrett on *Hipp.* 794, who states that "I ask '*μῶν* X' *when I am reluctant to accept X as true*", this reluctance being due to apprehension or surprise. Cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 794 (the newly arrived Theseus, wondering why there is no cheerful welcome:) μῶν Πιτθέωc τι γῆραc εἴργαcται νέον; similarly apprehensive also 1160, *Alc.* 812, 820. Comparing the passage in *Hipp.* 790 ff. I think it is conceivable that in our passage too something had just happened or been said which gave rise to Kresphontes' suspicions: one could think e.g. of an attempt of γ̄ to make Kresphontes leave again (cf. the old portress in *Hel.* 437 ff.). In any case one may safely assume that the dialogue did not start in 13, but that at least a few introductory lines preceded at the bottom of col. I.

A reason for Polyphontes' inhospitality may have been his fear that a stranger could be young Kresphontes, coming home incognito in order to take revenge for his father and brothers—as indeed he was. We may compare the behaviour of Theoklymenos in *Hel.* 151 ff., 437 ff.; in itself fear is a typical feature of tyrants; cf. Collard on *Su.* 444-6.

ἄδικο]c: after μῶν we expect an adjective which expresses negative behaviour towards strangers, and ἄδικο]c̣ is attractive. Terms of justice or

piety are well attested in connection with people's attitude to strangers: cf. e.g. *Alc.* 1147 f. (quoted below), *Cyc.* 125, *Hec.* 852, 1233 ff.

οἴκων δε[c]πότηc: cf. *Alc.* 681 ἐγὼ δέ c' οἴκων δεcπότην ἐγεινάμην, 806, *Ion* 1536, and 17 below. If we take into account the context and testimonia it is obvious that οἴκων (and 17 δόμων, 20 δῶμα) must indicate the palace of Polyphontes. In itself these words are rather vague and may indicate several kinds of background; cf. Hourmouziades 13.

περὶ ξένουc: for this use of περί with acc. cf. LSJ s.v. C 5; it may be used to qualify either adjectives or verbs and always indicates 'behaviour towards...'; cf. e.g. *Alc.* 1147 f. καὶ δίκαιοc ὢν / τὸ λοιπόν, Ἄδμητ', εὐcέβει περὶ ξένουc, *Cyc.* 125 φιλόξενοι δὲ χὤcιοι περὶ ξένουc, *Su.* 367, *IA* 1183 f. etc. For a similar question cf. A. *Ch.* 655 f. (Or.:) τρίτον τόδ' ἐκπέραμα δωμάτων καλῶ, / εἴπερ φιλόξεν' ἐcτὶν Αἰγίcθου διαί.

14 The way in which one has to fill in the gap depends on the supplement in 13. After a negative expression like ἄδικοc one wants a confirmative answer in the gap. Both Kassel's [νῦν γ'] and Dale's [ζῶν γ'] would fulfil this requirement and are attractive: (1) [νῦν γ']: I did not find examples in tragedy of ὁ νῦν being thus used as a substantive, but it is well attested as an adj. in Sophocles and Euripides (less often in Aeschylus) and one could easily supply δεcπότηc here from the preceding line, cf. also A. *Pers.* 184 μεγέθει τε τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεcτάτα πολύ, sc. γυναικῶν from 181; E. *Med.* 948 τῶν νῦν ἐν ἀνθρώποιcιν, sc. δώρων from 947; on this use of adverbs see in general KG 1, 594 ff., Schwyzer 2, 415 f. A drawback of [νῦν γ'], however, is that it seems a little short for the gap, (2) [ζῶν γ']: this supplement has the advantage of filling the gap exactly and providing perhaps a closer contrast with ὁ δ'οὐκ ὢν; I have therefore printed it in the text. Dale's [μὲν ὢν γ'] is definitely too long.

If the question in 13 was such as to demand a negative answer (but that is very unlikely, see comm. on 13), the gap has to be filled in accordingly. Turner's [μὲν οὐ]ḳ might be a possibility, but it is really too long and κ is palaeographically unlikely. Besides, ọ [μὲν οὐ]ḳ, ὁ δ' οὐκ ὢν πᾶcι προcφιλέcτατοc sounds to me rather clumsy.

προcφιλέcτατοc: the adj. must here be taken in an active sense, in order to create the required contrast with 13: περὶ ξένουc indicates that the discussion is about *behaviour* towards strangers (see comm. ad loc.), and we expect that the opposite of this behaviour is mentioned here. On the whole προcφιλήc in an active sense is less common than in a passive sense. In tragedy we may compare S. *Ph.* 531 f. πῶc ἂν ὑμὶν ἐμφανὴc / ἔργωι γενοίμην, ὥc μ' ἔθεcθε προcφιλῆ; cf. further Th. 1, 92; 7, 86, 4. In both senses it can be connected with a dat.

15 ṭ[ίc δ'ἔc]ṭι: the answer in 16 indicates that 15 contained a question after the identity of the present master, so ṭ[ίc δ' ἔc]ṭι is a very likely

supplement; δ' which is required by the space, is very common in this type of questions; cf. e.g. *Heracl.* 114 τίς δ'ἐστὶ χώρας τῆσδε καὶ πόλεως ἄναξ; *Hel.* 459, *Ph.* 133, *Or.* 435 etc.; Denniston 173f. Turner[1] 79 mentions a possible objection: "Its drawback is that τίς would naturally refer to the last mentioned, ὁ πᾶσι προσφιλέστατος". But the present ἔστι is a sure indication that the words cannot refer to the dead king: as soon as somebody is dead you cannot ask τίς ἐστι; but τίς ἦν; (cf. the question in 17).

τὸν ... μηκέτ' ὄντ': Turner[1] 79 explained μηκέτ' as being influenced by the imperative φράσον, comparing *Hel.* 1288f. τὸν παρόντα μὲν / στέργειν πόσιν χρή, τὸν δὲ μηκέτ' ὄντ' ἐᾶν. But μηκέτ' in *Hel.* 1289 can easily be explained as 'generic' (on generic μή with part. or adj., often with the article, see KG 2, 201 Anm. 4) and in our passage too generic μή may be defensible, if we assume that the speaker finds it *generally* more important to deal with living persons first and prefers to discuss the dead only afterwards. This interpretation I find more attractive than Turner's, because the use of μή with the participle in cases where the leading verb has or would have μή (so e.g. an imperative) is in classical Greek on the whole restricted to cases where the participle is predicative in meaning (like e.g. A. *Ag.* 906f.); cf. A. C. Moorhouse, CQ 42, 1948, 35-40 (who on p. 38 mentions some exceptions to this rule in Euripides, but none of them with the article). The older view, i.e. that this phenomenon was caused by simple attraction (e.g. KG 2, 200), was defended against Moorhouse by W. K. Pritchett, AJPh 79, 1958, 392-404.

αὖθις: 'after that, later'; cf. e.g. *IT* 1312f. αὖθις τὰ τῶνδε σημανῶ· τὰ δ'ἐν ποσὶν / παρόντ' ἄκουσον, *Alc.* 502f., A. *Ag.* 317 and LSJ s.v. II 3.

16 ἀ[φ' Ἡ]ρ[α]κ̣λειδῶν: cf. test. 6, 2f. Πολυφόντης δὲ ἐβασίλευσεν, καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ὑπάρχων. The emphasis on the descendance of Polyphontes suggests that this figure was unfamiliar to the audience; see further on Polyphontes intr. 2.1 and comm. on test. 5, 1-2.

ξένε: this is an indication of the identity of ᾱ: if somebody is called 'stranger' in the *Kresphontes'*, there can be little doubt that this must be Kresphontes. With similar tragic irony we find the presumed stranger Orestes often thus addressed in E. *El.* (e.g. 247, 259, 265, 283 etc.) and the device is already effectively employed in the *Odyssey*; cf. Wendel 94f.

18 τοῦδε: the correction of the scribe, who has written υ *supra lineam* over τονδε is obviously right: τόνδε would be pointless here, whereas τοῦδε refers back to 16 ἀ[φ' Ἡ]ρ[α]κ̣λειδῶν. The words ταὐτοῦ γένους τοῦδε again emphasize that both Kresphontes Sr. and Polyphontes were Heraclids, probably in order to make the audience well aware of this fact (cf. comm. on 16).

οἶσθα ... κλύων: in 18-20 we find a fixed pattern, often used by Euripides in stichomythia; cf. e.g. *Ba.* 462ff. (Dionysos:) τὸν ἀνθεμώδη Τμῶλον οἶσθά που κλύων; / (Pentheus:) οἶδ', ὃς τὸ Σάρδεων ἄστυ περιβάλλει κύκλωι. /

(Dionysos:) ἐντεῦθέν εἰμι, Λυδία δέ μοι πατρίς, *Su.* 116 ff., *Ion* 936 ff., 987 ff., *IT* 517 ff., 812 ff., *Hel.* 98 ff., *Or.* 1183 ff.

Recurrent elements in these examples are: (1) in the first line the character who is giving information asks a question, which is really just meant to be an introduction to what he is going to tell (cf. E. Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae*, Gottingae 1912, 54, who explains this apparent changing of the parts within the stichomythia as a means to relieve its monotony); these questions are always of the type: 'Do you know...?' (οἶϲθα), (2) in the second line the other character, who is really the questioning party, now answers, often with οἶδα (in the passages mentioned above we find 4 × οἶδα, 1 × ἤκουϲα (*IT* 813), elliptic γε in *IT* 518, elliptic γάρ in *Su.* 117 and ναί *extra metrum* in *Hel.* 99), adding a special characteristic of the subject under discussion as if to prove that he really 'knows' it (*Su.* 117 and *IT* 518 are slightly different in this respect), (3) in the third line the person who is giving the information returns to his proper role of telling things, often with a demonstr. at the beginning of the line: 'Well, that/there ...'.

We do not find this pattern only at the beginning of stichomythiae, as Fraenkel o.c. 54 thinks (and also Dodds on *Ba.* 462 and Biehl on *Or.* 1181): of the examples mentioned above four are from the beginning and four from the middle of the stichomythia, as is our passage. For variations of this pattern cf. *Andr.* 563 f., *Ion* 794 f.; Fraenkel o.c. 56 ff. shows that it is imitated in S. *Tr.* 1191 ff., and in comedy by e.g. Anaxandrides fr. 9, 1-3 (2, 138 Kock), Pl. *Aulularia* 170 ff.

κλύων: in itself this form could be either aorist or present; but in expressions like this it is usually present; cf. lines like S. *OT* 105 ἔξοιδ' ἀκούων, where the present is certain. On κλύων/κλυών see further Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 580 and 680.

19 κτιϲτῆρα: the word κτιϲτήρ we find elsewhere only in a Corinthian inscription of the second half of IV B.C. (cf. K. K. Smith, *Greek inscriptions from Corinth* II, AJA 23, 1919, 331-393 no. 75, 3), where it is considered a dialectical variant of the Attic κτίϲτηϲ (cf. Smith o.c. 369 f.). In *Ion* 74 Ἴωνα δ' αὐτόν, κτίϲτορ' Ἀϲιάδοϲ χθονόϲ we find the form κτίϲτωρ, which is also attested in Pi. fr. 105 a 3 κτίϲτορ Αἴτναϲ, Diph. (?) fr. 138 (2, 580 Kock), Ath. 9, 9, 370 c; cf. Ernst Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -τηϲ (-τ-)*, Strassburg 1910-12, 1, 179 n. 2.

This type of *nomen agentis*, which is frequent in Homer, becomes obsolete in the Ionic-Attic dialect, but survives in the other dialects (many examples in inscriptions) and in tragic language: many of them are attested only in tragedy, especially in lyrics and messenger-speeches (where we find of course much Doric and epic influence), but also, like here, in dialogue. Cf. in general Fraenkel o.c. passim (2, 1-50 about tragedy); Chantraine 321-29; E. Benveniste, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en Indo-Européen*, Paris 1948, 28-62

(showing the semantic differences between *nomina agentis* in -tōr and -tēr; conclusions on p. 62).

20 τοῦτον: see comm. on 18.

21 τύχαις ἀκουσίοις: 'or did it happen against his will?' It seems best to thus paraphrase τύχαις ἀκουσίοις, in which ἀκουσίοις (generally used of 'acts or their consequences'; cf. LSJ s.v. ἀεκούσιος; Kastner 94) recalls Attic legal terminology where it can be used of unintentional crimes; cf. e.g. Antiphon 3, 2, 6 ἀκουσίου δὲ τοῦ φόνου ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὑμῖν ὁμολογουμένου γένεσθαι, Pl. *Lg.* 864 a etc. The whole expression τύχαις ἀκουσίοις seems to be best compared with such expressions as *IA* 511 f. ἀλλ' ἥκομεν γὰρ εἰς ἀναγκαίας τύχας, / θυγατρὸς αἱματηρὸν ἐκπρᾶξαι φόνον (virtually a paraphrase for ἀνάγκη, cf. LSJ s.v. τύχη I 2).

If the question contains a serious alternative, that is, if τύχαις ἀκουσίοις is not added for the sake of filling up the line in order to keep the stichomythia going (on such lines cf. A. Gross, *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie und Komödie*, Berlin 1905, 88 ff.) or out of a desire for polar expression (cf. Fehling 274 ff.), it presupposes a way of thinking in which it was the intention that counted, but not the 'fact' of killing as in archaic thought; on this notion cf. A. Dihle, Gymn. 69, 1962, 28 ff. (on Hdt. 1, 34 ff. where the involuntary killer Adrastus is forgiven by Croesus). Even so, Athenian law did still impose exile as a penalty for unintentional homicide in late V-IV B.C. (cf. D. M. MacDowell, *Athenian Homicide Law*, Manchester 1963, 117 ff.; Barrett on *Hipp.* 37), and the idea of Polyphontes simply becoming king after killing his brother is somewhat surprising, so that I should be reluctant to regard it as a serious alternative.

ἀκουσίοις: -οις is palaeographically more attractive than -αις; on the "Motionslosigkeit" of ἀκούσιος see Kastner 94 f.

22 βίαι δολώσας: this way of coming to power is also typical of tyrants; cf. also the emphasis which is laid on this aspect in *HF* 33, 541 ff. (Lykos) and for contrast *Or.* 1167 f.; cf. Bengl 75.

τυραννεύοι: perhaps we may here, because of the context, take τυραννεύοι to be used *in malam partem* (as in e.g. *Su.* 403 ff.); still, in itself τύραννος, τυραννεύω etc. do not have this connotation in Euripides: they are often used in a neutral or even favourable sense; cf. e.g. *HF* 29 (with Wilamowitz and Bond ad loc.), *El.* 877 etc.; see further Bengl 59 f., Page on *Med.* 348.

23 γυναικὸς ἄζυγα: ἄζυξ, meaning 'unmarried', is in tragedy typical of Euripides. In Aeschylus and Sophocles the word is not attested, so that its occurrence here has been adduced in support of the attribution of *POxy.* 2458 to Euripides (so. Cengarle 67). But in A. *Pers.* 137 we find μονόζυξ 'single, solitary' (LSJ s.v. I), which reveals the fragility of this kind of argument. The only author with whom we perhaps find ἄζυξ before Euripides is Archilochus: cf. fr. 54, 5 West] αὐχέν' · ἦδε δ' αζ[, where Lobel (on *POxy.* 22, 2312 fr. 4 [a]

5) suggested to supply ἄζ[υγα. As the fragment seems to be about Lykambes and his daughters, it may well be that the adj. — if the supplement is right — refers to one of the daughters (cf. ibid. 15 παρθέ[ν-) and means 'unmarried' here too; cf. also Archil. fr. 262 West, where ἀζυγής is attested for Archilochus. After Euripides we find ἄζυξ of an unmarried girl in Theoc. 27, 7; cf. also Nonn. *D.* 1, 345; 4, 5; 5, 223 etc. (see further Peek's lexicon s.v.).

Euripides uses the adj. for both men and women, sometimes in an absolute sense (so *Tr.* 536, *Ba.* 694), sometimes connected with a gen.; so e.g. *Med.* 673 οὐκ ἐcμὲν εὐνῆc ἄζυγεc γαμηλίου, *Hipp.* 1425 κόραι ... ἄζυγεc γάμων; cf. Breitenbach 192f., KG 1, 401f., Wilamowitz on *HF* 114, Bond on *Hyps.* fr. I, I 11, Collard on *Su.* 35. Often these genitives are merely pleonastic, though sometimes we find cases where they are not; cf. e.g. *Ph.* 324 ἄπεπλοc φαρέων λευκῶν (the adj. prevents the expression from being pleonastic), S. *Aj.* 321, *El.* 36 (cf. Kaibel on 32-37), 1002.

24 cυγκ[ατέ]κτεινεν: 'he killed ... together with their father': the meaning of the verb is clear from the context. Apart from here we find the word attested only twice in tragedy: *Or.* 1089 καὶ cυγκατέκτανον γάρ, where it must mean 'I killed in cooperation with you' and seems to be chosen for the sake of the parallellism with 1091 ξυνθανεῖν (cf. Di Benedetto ad loc.) and S. *Aj.* 230ff. cυγκατακτὰc / ... βοτὰ καὶ / βοτῆραc, interpreted by Jebb ad loc. as "slain in a confused heap, cattle and men together" (cf. also Kamerbeek ad loc.). For composite verbs in which cυγκατα- has the same meaning as in our passage cf. e.g. *Or.* 735 cυγκαταcκάπτοιc ἂν ἡμᾶc, X. *An.* 3, 2, 27 πρῶτον μὲν ... κατακαῦcαι τὰc ἁμάξαc ... ἔπειτα καὶ τὰc cκηνὰc cυγκατακαῦcαι, App. *BC* 4, 42 αἰτῶ δὴ cε τὸν πατέρα cώιζειν δι' ἐμὲ ἢ δι' ἐκεῖνον ἐμὲ cυγκατακτανεῖν, Konon *FGrH* 26 F 1, 17.

In the *editio princeps* we find cυνκ[ατα]κτειναc, which has been corrected by Lloyd-Jones[1] 444 (cf. Musso[2] 267, Turner[4] 256).

The children were of course killed in order to prevent revenge. Cf. e.g. *Andr.* 519ff. and Stevens ad loc.

25 ἦ ... δῆτα: this combination is further attested in Euripides only in *Ion* 560 (antilabe), *IT* 1176 and *IA* 862 (both in stichomythia); cf. Denniston 271.

τέκνων cπορά: cf. for this expression S. *Ant.* 1164 θάλλων εὐγενεῖ τέκνων cπορᾶι, Men. *Comp.* 2, 199 Jaekel ἀπώλεcα πάνθ' †ὅcον ἐκεκτήμην βίον†, / χρήματα, γυναῖκα καὶ τέκνων πολλῶν cποράν.

πᾶc' ... κα[ὶ]: the combination of πᾶc' and κα[ὶ] seems at first sight a little odd, but can, I think, be easily explained: the literal interpretation is: 'Is his whole offspring killed as well?' This is slightly illogical as it could be taken to imply the possibility that of the father too only part had been killed. So, apparently, two questions are combined here: (1) 'Are all his children dead?' (leading up to the answer in 26), (2) 'Is his offspring destroyed as well?', i.e. just like their father.

26 εἷς ἐστι παίδων λοιπ[όϲ]: cf. *Andr.* 406 εἷς παῖς ὅδ' ἦν μοι λοιπός, *Ph.* 942.

εἴπερ ἔστ' ἔτι: tragic irony as in *El.* 557 ὅδ' ἔσθ' ὁ σώσας κεῖνον, εἴπερ ἔστ' ἔτι (Elektra speaking about Orestes to Orestes-in-disguise); cf. also *Alex.* fr. 46 Snell εἴ που ἔτι ζῷ[ει; *Od.* 14, 44 (Eumaios to Odysseus:) εἴ που ἔτι ζώει καὶ ὁρᾶι φάος ἠελίοιο (sc. Odysseus); Bond on *Hyps.* fr. 61, 6 (p. 55). There is no reason to regard the words as an indication that γ̄ had already heard that young Kresphontes was lost (so Lloyd-Jones[1] 444: "The words may well imply that the speaker has heard that the young prince is missing"): it is natural enough that γ̄ had some doubts about the matter even without evidence.

27 τόν ... θάνατο[ν καὶ] τύχας ὑπεκφυγών: there seems to be no other way to fill the gap, though at first sight it is not easy to see what exactly τύχας has to mean. Turner[1] 79 translated: "his appointed death and fate", which, however, is rather difficult to accept because of the plural and because τύχη is not one's 'appointed' fate. The plural might be better accounted for if we could take τύχας to indicate the (other) dangers and misfortunes to which the child might have been exposed after surviving the massacre (cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 673 πᾶι ποτ' ἐξαλύξω τύχας; *HF* 314f. σκοπεῖν / ὅπως διώσηι τὰς τύχας), but then the combination θάνατο[ν καὶ] τύχας — 'death and the other dangers' does not sound to me particularly attractive or convincing.

A way out of the difficulties may be found if we compare the whole expression τόν ... θάνατο[ν καὶ] τύχας ὑπεκφυγών with certain epic formulas for escaping death, of which our line is reminiscent; cf. especially *Od.* 2, 352 θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἀλύξας (the other instances of this formula are listed by Dietrich 246 n. 8); 12, 157 θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν (other instances in Dietrich 246 n. 7; cf. also Hes. fr. 76, 22 M-W and in a context similar to ours fr. 35, 9 M-W); 9, 61 φύγομεν θάνατόν τε μόρον τε (also 11, 409; 16, 421). In these passages the expression θάνατον καὶ κῆρας (etc.) stands for 'death' (cf. Dietrich 243 ff.) and it seems likely that in our passage too τόν ... θάνατο[ν καὶ] τύχας simply means 'his death' and that the rather surprising τύχας must be explained as a variation on κῆρας (etc.) and need not have a clearly defined meaning of its own.

ὑπεκφυγών: this word is attested in Euripides also in *Med.* 987f. ἄταν δ' / οὐχ ὑπεκφεύξεται, *Su.* 565; further in tragedy: S. *Ant.* 553 and 776 (and in a variant reading in A. *Pers.* 100). In Homer it is very common, also of escaping death; cf. e.g. *Il.* 5, 22 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα μέλαιναν, 16, 687 etc.

28 θηλῆς: in tragedy only here; cf. *Cyc.* 55ff. σπαργῶντας μαστοὺς χάλασον· / δέξαι θηλαῖσι †σποράς / ἃς λείπεις ἀρνῶν θαλάμοις, of a sheep. In S.F 98 we find θηλάστρια in the sense of τροφός. Cengarle 67 used this word as one of the arguments in favour of attributing our papyrus to Euripides.

cμ[ικρ]ὸc: as to the sense this is an attractive supplement; cf. for cμικρόc of a small child e.g. *Or.* 462 καὶ γάρ μ' ἔθρεψε cμικρὸν ὄντα, X. *Ages.* 1, 21 παιδάρια μικρὰ, *hAphr.* 115, Tyrt. fr. 10, 6 W. In Aeschylus and Sophocles cμικρόc is not attested in this sense: Sophocles uses the word twice of people, but then it means 'weak, unimportant' (*Aj.* 158, *OC* 958); cf. also Pi. *P.* 3, 107.

A difficulty is that μ[is not quite convincing and that the word only fits the space if the scribe wrote cμειкρoc (the papyrus contains no other examples of this kind of spelling-mistake).

ετ[.]': if the papyrus had ετι' the space between ι and the diastole is rather wide (2 mms after ι); this is a drawback, but on the other hand it is very hard to think of a better alternative (for ξ the trace is definitely too high and the top of a long upright would not be thus rounded). With ετ[.]' Görschen's ἐξέδυ can no longer be claimed to be supported by the traces in the papyrus; nor is it very attractive in other respects: in itself ἐξέδυ can bear the meaning 'he escaped' (sc. his death) and we do find it twice in this sense in Euripides. But then it is used of independent actions of grown-up people (so *Su.* 416, *IT* 602); also the examples in LSJ s.v. ἐκδύω III 2 are always about the escape or emerging of a grown-up person (S. F 341 is, I think, no exception). This makes the supplement a good deal less likely in a context about the rescue of a baby. Apart from that, it is not necessary that we should have a verb here: the idea of escaping is sufficiently expressed in the line above (ὑπεκφυγών), and it may well be that the answer just gave the reason why he could escape, without repeating the fact that he did so; the pattern of the lines would then be very similar to *Ion* 279 f. (Ion:) cὺ δ' ἐξεcώθηc πῶc καcιγνήτων μόνη; / (Kreousa:) βρέφοc νεογνὸν μητρὸc ἦν ἐν ἀγκάλαιc (cf. also *Alc.* 1139 f., *El.* 276 f.). An attractive supplement would then be ἐτ' [ἐν] τ[ροφαῖc 'still in the nursery', for which one could adduce as a parallel A. *Th.* 664 f. ἀλλ' οὔτε νιν φυγόντα μητρόθεν cκότον / οὔτ' ἐν τροφαῖcιν οὔτ' ἐφηβήcαντά πω; for τροφή meaning 'nurture, rearing' (often in plural) cf. further LSJ s.v. II 1 and in Euripides e.g. *Su.* 1136, *Tr.* 1187. (If the traces in the papyrus were not against it, one could also consider ἐν cπαργάνοιc, cf. A. *Ch.* 755 οὐ γάρ τι φωνεῖ παῖc ἔτ' ὢν ἐν cπαργάνοιc and Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 31 [345, 6] φήcαc [sc. Kypselos] ἐν cπαργάνοιc εἶναι [sc. his grandson]).

29 Barrett's supplements are very attractive and probably right: for ἔκδημο[c] τῆc[δ' ... χθ[ονόc cf. e.g. *Ba.* 215 ἔκδημοc ὢν μὲν τῆcδ' ἐτύγχανον χθονόc (more in Diggle on *Phaeth.* 111). ἢ 'πιχ]ώριοc is a less obvious supplement: ἐπιχώριοc must here be synonymous with ἐπίδημοc 'present in the land' (cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπίδημοc 2). I found no other examples of ἐπιχώριοc being used in this sense: it always appears to mean 'native to the land' (though perhaps Arist. *HA* 615 a 14 ἔcτι δ' οὐδὲ πολλαχοῦ ἐπιχώριοc ὁ ὄρνιc contains a connotation of 'presence'). Even so, this should be no reason to reject the supplement: Euripides may have used the word here for the sake

of variation after ἔκδημος, whereas its unusual meaning would be immediately clear from the context. Such proceedings would be not at all unlike Euripides. Palaeographically it is also possible, because τῆς[δ' ἡ 'πιχ]ώριος fills the gap exactly, when written with aphaeresis and diastole.

For the redundant expression (adj. + gen. instead of a simple prepositional construction) cf. e.g. *IT* 80 ἠλαυνόμεσθα φυγάδες ἔξεδροι χθονός, A. *Eu.* 669, S. *Aj.* 796, *El.* 1386; KG 1, 385 Anm. 4. (Turner's supplement is based on a wrong reading of the papyrus).

30 μητρ[ὸ]ς [π]ατὴρ νιν[: these words have been read for me by W. S. Barrett, and when reinspecting the papyrus I found his reading absolutely convincing. This implies that test. 6, 5f. τρίτον γὰρ ἔχουσα παῖδα Μερόπη καλούμενον Αἴπυτον ἔδωκε τῶι ἑαυτῆς πατρὶ τρέφειν probably goes back on Euripides (except for the name Aipytos); cf. also Paus. 4, 3, 8 and Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 31. Of course we cannot be quite sure about the grandfather's role, because the latter part of the line is lost, but that he played an important part in the rescue of young Kresphontes also in Euripides can now be regarded as established. Cf. also on test. 6, 5-6.

In order to make 30 an answer to the question in 29 'Where is he?' we must assume that the latter part of the line contained some reference to a place; hence Barrett's suggestion [ἔτρεφεν Ἀρκάδων ἄναξ; one could also think of e.g. [ἐξέσωσ' εἰς Ἀρκάδας; cf. fr. 349 Αἰθιοπίαν νιν (sc. Eumolpum) ἐξέσωσ' ἐπὶ χθόνα, *El.* 28 μήτηρ νιν (sc. Electram) ἐξέσωσεν Αἰγίσθου χερός.

31 ἥξει[: although the letters are badly damaged this seems to be the only reading which accounts for all the traces. In this way Kresphontes could begin a question about e.g. the return of the child: 'Do you think he will come back in order to take revenge?' We often find the future tense of ἥκω referring to the possible return of somebody who is abroad; cf. e.g. *El.* 263 εἰ δή ποθ' ἥξει γ'ἐς δόμους ὁ νῦν ἀπών, *Hel.* 278, 534, 540, *HF* 75.

ἥξει[may be either ind. fut. (3rd pers. sg.) or inf. fut. (for ἥξει at the beginning of a trimeter cf. e.g. *El.* 656, *Or.* 1211; for ἥξειν e.g. *HF* 296, *Tr.* 428, *Hel.* 534, *Ph.* 83). Austin's πέφ[ευγε seems to me palaeographically impossible.

fr. 3

32 ff. This fragment has been placed after fr. 1 col. II by Barrett apud Austin (for details see intr. 3.1 and comm. on 34). The metrical position of the lines is guaranteed by 35, which because of Porson's law must be × –]ανόντος ταυτ[⏑ – × – ⏑ –.

32] παῖς: this reading seems fairly certain (see app.). The fact that παῖς occurs again in 34 should be no objection; cf. J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica*, Oxford 1955, 220 ff. (many examples of such repetitions); Pearson on *Hel.* 674; Diggle on *Phaeth.* 56.

ọδε̣[: here the division of the letters is uncertain: ọ δε̣[or ọδ'[or ọδ'ε̣[is possible (I cannot see whether or not there was a diastole after δ, but there would be enough room for it; cf. e.g. fr. 3, 7; fr. 2 col. II 6).

It looks as if the line contained a question about the surviving child: if fr. 3 is from the stichomythia, all even lines must be questions, because of 34, which undoubtedly is a question.

33 **]εcγεκλη̣[**: if this fragment is part of the stichomythia and 34 part of another question by Kresphontes, this must be part of an answer of γ̄. As the reading of the last letter is not altogether certain, two possibilities should be considered: (1) if κληζ̣[is the right reading, we may think of a form of κλῄζω 'mention, speak of' (LSJ s.v. I 2; cf. e.g. *Hel.* 126 ὡc κεῖνοc ἀφανὴc cὺν δάμαρτι κλῄζεται, 132, 927) or 'call' (LSJ s.v. II; cf. e.g. *Ph.* 10 ἐγὼ δὲ παῖc μὲν κλῄζομαι Μενοικέωc, *IT* 917). As to the possible forms of the verb it should be noticed that in Euripides passive forms of κλῄζω appear to be more frequent than active, and that an augmented form is not much favoured by the papyrus: in that case one would rather expect a diastole after]̣εcγ or scriptio plena (cf. intr. 3.1); (2) if κληδ̣[is the right reading, this may be part of an oblique form of κληδών, which we find used by Euripides with the meaning 'tidings, report, rumour' (LSJ s.v. II 1; cf. *HF* 1166f. κληδὼν γὰρ ἦλθεν εἰc 'Ερεχθειδῶν πόλιν / ὡc ..., *Hel.* 1250) or 'fame, repute, glory' (LSJ s.v. II 2; cf. e.g. *Alc.* 959). The first meaning would suit a context in which Kresphontes is asking questions about the child which was brought up abroad: these matters γ̄ could know only from hearsay; yet the other meaning cannot be excluded. Musso's κεκλη[μένοc is palaeographically impossible.

In the first part of the line]εc may be an adj. neutr., nom. pl., second pers. sg. of a verb, or perhaps the prep. ἐc (in the mss. of Euripides εἰc is the usual form, but the papyri are not consistent in this matter: ἐc before consonant we find in e.g. *PRyl.* 3, 482, 3 [*Telephos*, II A.D.], *BKT* V 17, 1, 11 and 26 [*Cret.*, I A.D.], *POxy.* 6, 852 fr. 64 col. II 65 [*Hyps.*, II/III A.D.; though in this papyrus we usually find εἰc]). Why]εcτε was changed into]εcγε we have no means of knowing, but of course confusion of τ and γ is common enough.

34 **] δὴ τί**: the metrical position of]δὴ τί makes the supplement δὲ] δὴ τί very attractive: the combination δὲ δὴ τί (τίc, τίν', πῶc) is attested in questions 13 × in Euripides: 9 × in stichomythia (*Heracl.* 963, *Su.* 147, *HF* 1246, *El.* 237, 276, 974, *Ph.* 709, *Or.* 101, 425), once in hemistichomythia (*Ph.* 1277) and 3 × in other cases (*Hipp.* 722, *Su.* 457, *HF* 206). In all these cases it occurs in the same position in the line; cf. e.g. *El.* 276 ἐλθὼν δὲ δὴ πῶc φονέαc ἂν κτάνοι πατρόc; *Ph.* 709 λέγει δὲ δὴ τί τῶν ἐκεῖ νεώτερον; etc. Also when followed by indefinite τιc we find δὲ δὴ in this position in the iambic trimeter (cf. e.g. *Su.* 314, *HF* 26, *Ph.* 580, *Or.* 52, 62, 874). Cf. Denniston 259, Barrett on *Hipp.* 722.

The frequent occurrence of δὲ δὴ τί in stichomythia was the main argument for locating fr. 3 after fr. 1 col. II.

ομη̣[: there can be little doubt about this reading and we have no reason to assume that the scribe wanted to change anything here, as was suspected by Barrett apud Austin. Palaeographically Barrett adduced two arguments for his idea: "(a) the o has a highly anomalous tail ϙ, (b) above the μ is a spot of ink touching the edge of the papyrus on the right and touching an apparently stripped area above. It may be that the tail of the o is in fact a diagonal stroke intended to cancel the letter; and that the ink above μ is part of a superscript letter intended as a correction (cf. 18, 29, 59, 73)" (W. S. Barrett in a letter of 1967 to C. Austin). However, both arguments must be discarded: the tail is not a deletion-mark, but rather due to the fact that o was written by two strokes of the pen; cf. for similar tails e.g. *POxy.* 7, 1015, 22 (photograph in Turner[7] 50); 18, 2161 col. II 14 and 16 (photograph in Turner[7] 24); *PLond.* 1, 110, 2 (photograph in Roberts 18 a). In the original there is no ink above μ: there is only a bit of shade on the photograph.

We have therefore no palaeographical reasons to assume that ὁμη̣[ρεύει has been corrected into ἀλη̣[τεύει, so it seems better to obey the rule 'iuxta lacunam ne mutaveris' (cf. R. Merkelbach, *Lex Youtie*, ZPE 38, 1980, 294) and try to find an explanation for ομη[. Some possibilities are: (1) ὅμηρος, ὁμηρεύω; but a difficulty is that none of our testimonia offers any indication that Kresphontes was a hostage, (2) a substantive like ὁμήγυρις or ὁμῆλιξ, though I cannot see what one could do with either of those here, (3) one has to read ο μη[, i.e. either ὁ μή with a part. or adj. (cf. KG 2, 201 f. Anm. 4), so e.g. ὁ μὴ [θανών or ὃ μή followed by an optative, like e.g. *Ph.* 571 ὃ μὴ τύχοι ποτέ (but I cannot see how this could fit in with the interrogative τί), (4) perhaps there is some prospect in the verb ὁμηρέω, for which cf. *Od.* 16, 468 ὡμήρηcε δέ μοι παρ' ἑταίρων ἄγγελος ὠκύς, where the verb may mean 'met' or 'agreed with me', sc. by telling the same story; Hes. *Th.* 39 φωνῆι ὁμηρεῦcαι (sc. the Muses) 'with voices in tune' (West ad loc.); cf. also LSJ s.v.: such a word would fit a context about similarities between father and son as is suggested by 35; yet it is hard to see what form of the verb would fit the sense without violating Porson's law.

On the whole (3) ὁ μή + part. or adj. seems to me the likeliest interpretation. One could think of e.g. ὄνομα δὲ] δὴ τί παῖς ὁ μὴ [θανὼν φέρει; keeping Barrett's idea that 34 f. were about the child's name. For ὄνομα... φέρει cf. *Hel.* 66 ὄνομα... φέρω.

35 × – **]α̣νόντος ταυτ[** ⏑ – × – ⏑ –: because of Porson's law this is the only way to fit 35 into a iambic trimeter, so that from 35 we are able to deduce the metrical position of fr. 3.

]α̣νόντος ταυτ[: θ]α̣νόντος or κατθ]α̣νόντος referring to Kresphontes Sr. is an attractive supplement, but does not, of course, exhaust the possibilities (one could also think of e.g. κτ]α̣νόντος). Barrett's supplement τοῦ κατθ]α̣νόντος ταὐτ[ὸ (sc. ὄνομα) Κρεcφόντου πατρός, is very neat, and the connec-

tion of ὁ αὐτός with a genitive can be defended with two parallels from similar contexts: *HF* 31 οὗ ταὐτὸν ὄνομα παῖς πατρὸς κεκλημένος (of Lykos) and *Hel.* 487 f. ὄνομα δὲ ταὐτὸν τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχουςά τις / δάμαρτος ἄλλη τοιςίδ' ἐνναίει δόμοις. In both passages it seems best to accept ὁ αὐτός + gen. KG 1, 413 Anm. 10 do not mention this among their examples of adjectives which are sometimes connected with gen. instead of dat.; yet attempts to interpret ὁ αὐτός differently here are unsatisfactory: Wilamowitz and Bond on *HF* 31 want to connect πατρὸς κεκλημένος 'named after his father' (but the examples of gen. with εἶναι and καλεῖςθαι adduced by Bond are not relevant, because there the expression means only 'son of'; cf. KG 1, 374 f.), which would make ταὐτὸν ὄνομα into a cognate acc. ("epexegetischer Zusatz" according to Wilamowitz). This may explain *HF* 31, but cannot be maintained for *Hel.* 487 f. (which neither Bond nor Wilamowitz mentions), where no εἶναι or καλεῖςθαι is found; Dale ad loc. let the gen. depend on ὄνομα, which would then be "reinforced by ταὐτὸν — my wife's name, exactly the same", which is equally unsatisfactory. Additional arguments in favour of Barrett's idea are: (1) Kresphontes did have 'the same name as his dead father', (2) a question and answer about the child's name are very well conceivable in the stichomythia.

A drawback is the fact that the gravis on ταὐτ[would indicate that we must read ταὐτ[ὰ, not ταῦτ[α (on the ways in which the different meanings of homonyms are indicated by accents in the papyri cf. Laum 340 ff.). This accentuation seems to make ταὐτ[ὸ less likely, because in that case there would be no ambiguity and no need for an accent. Even so, we need not regard this as a fatal objection to Barrett's idea, as our scribe does not appear to have been very good at accents (see intr. 3.1); also it should be borne in mind that a new weighing of all the evidence that has come to light since Laum might force us to modify our views on some points — perhaps on this one too. Another difficult point remains the interpretation of 34 ομη̣[.

36]ν': e.g. part of a verb or acc. sg.

εχθ̣.̣.̣[: probably something about 'the hatred' between Kresphontes c.s. on the one hand and Polyphontes c.s. on the other hand. The reading of the letters after θ is very uncertain and it is hard to decide the width of the tear.

37 χρη̣[: there are several possibilities here; e.g. χρή, some form of χρήιζω, χρῆμα, χρήςιμος, χρηςμός, χρηςτός. An oracle (χρηςμός) does not at first sight seem very likely, but none of the other possibilities can be excluded.

fr. 2 col. I

39 ff. Placing of fr. 2 below fr. 1 col. II and III is physically possible, though not cogent; see intr. 3. 1. Decisive arguments for this position must therefore

be sought in its contents: so e.g. Mette[1] 391, who argued "... man erwartet weitere Fragen nach dem Verhalten der Mutter dieser Söhne gegenüber dem Usurpator Polyphontes; und gerade in diese Richtung weisen die Reste der col. I des bisherigen 'fr. 2', zumal wenn die zweite Zeile mit F 1060 identisch sein sollte". This location was accepted by Austin and Musso[6], who offered no new arguments.

Yet other locations were defended too: Cengarle 68-71 and Burnett 19 f. believed that the fragment belonged to another scene, because they inferred from 45 and 46 respectively, that Polyphontes, who does not appear in the prologue, was on stage in fr. 2 (for details see comm.). Cengarle 70 n. 19 mentioned as an additional—but, I think, more important—argument that 70 ff. look more like a "canto episodico" than like a parodos (but see below); Webster 139 f., who also refused to believe that the choral lament in 70 ff. could be from the parodos, wanted to place the fragment in the scene where Kresphontes is asking his promised reward from Polyphontes, so that the chorus could be "lamenting the supposed death of the young Kresphontes" (Webster 140).

Obviously all these arguments are fairly subjective, and even Mette's arguments are far from decisive: 40-42 probably deal with Merope and after that there is something about enemies and revenge: it is very likely that all this was discussed in the stichomythia, but it may have been mentioned in other parts of the play as well. Also it should be noticed that, if the identification of 40 with fr. 1060 were right, it would be hard to fit 40 into the stichomythia (see comm. ad loc.). Still, I have accepted Mette's location, especially because two points can be added to the 'general fitness' of col. I for this position: (1) 46] ἑϲτίαϲ ἴθι would be very suitable for the end of the dialogue between Kresphontes and γ̄ (see comm. ad loc.), (2) the second line of col. II (69].εϲ· τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐπειδ.[) could be interpreted as the end of Kresphontes' prayer in fr. 1 col. III (see comm. ad loc.). The choral passage in 70 ff. seems to offer the most substantial argument against placing fr. 2 below fr. 1 col. II + 3: it is true that the lament does not look very much like a parodos, but on the other hand the remains are too scanty to allow a firm conclusion. It may well be, after all, that the chorus, when appearing on stage, was lamenting the situation in the land (cf. fr. 453); one could compare the parodoi in A. *Ch.* 22 ff. and E. *HF* 107 ff.

In conclusion, I think we may say that there are no arguments which are fatal for placing fr. 2 after fr. 1 col. II + 3, and a few points rather in favour of it.

39 The traces are very uncertain, but Mette's ἀϲυ]νετῳ[τ]ε̣[ρ must certainly be excluded. As to]. .[Turner[1] 80 remarks: "The ... ink marks could be accidental or have some reference to the following column (e.g. part of a dramatic *siglum*)". Now this has to be rejected: the ink marks do not look as

if they were accidental and they are well within the right-hand margin of this column (only fr. 2 col. I 3 and 8 are much shorter), which would be an odd position for a dramatic siglum.

40 δ|άμαρτ' ἔχειν: Mette[1] 391 thought that this line overlapped with fr. 1060 ἐχθροῖcιν εἴη πολεμίαν δάμαρτ' ἔχειν and used it as an indication that fr. 2 col. I was a continuation of the stichomythia in fr. 1 col. II + 3. This identification was accepted by Austin 44, Cengarle 66 and Burnett 19; Musso[6] 33 was doubtful, following Webster 139 n. 35. Musso and Webster rightly argue that δάμαρτ' ἔχειν at the end of a iambic trimeter also occurs in *IT* 696, *Heracl.* 523. The expression is really quite common; cf. also e.g. *Andr.* 626, *El.* 34 f., *Hel.* 581. All this makes the identification far from cogent.

Besides, if we are still in the stichomythia, the identification becomes very unlikely. Mette[1] 391 remarks: "Der Stil dieses Fragmentes lässt den Schluss zu, dass die Zeile im Rahmen einer Stichomythie als Antwort auf die Mitteilung gesprochen wurde, dass die Gattin, um die es sich hier handelte, ihrem gegenwärtigen Manne gegenüber feindselig gesinnt sei". I cannot see, however, how the line could be spoken by either Kresphontes or γ̄: it rather suggests a speaker who suffers from his wife's hostility and wishes the same for his enemies (we may compare *Hipp.* 1082 f.). Also it is hard to see how the line would fit into a simple informative stichomythia, as a general wish like this would really break the chain of questions and answers. If fr. 2 col. I is from the stichomythia, I rather expect a question or answer here about '⟨Polyphontes, who wanted⟩ to have ⟨Merope⟩ as his wife'.

If the fragment is not from the stichomythia, there are no reasons to reject the identification, but even so it is far from cogent (it is, in that case, most likely to be spoken by Polyphontes, as was assumed by Cengarle 70 and Burnett 19 f., who find proof of his 'presence' in this fragment in 45 and 46; where see comm.).

41 πόcιν: the mention of a husband would also fit a context about Merope.

42 δέρην: with δέρην several interpreations should be considered. Euripides uses δέρη 18 × in contexts about cutting somebody's throat (15 × a woman's), 7 × about people who hang themselves (6 × a woman) and 12 × in other cases. Now we have no indications that someone is committing suicide in the *Kresphontes*, but of course a remark on committing suicide cannot be excluded (some references to women hanging themselves in E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge* ... 2, Roma 1964, 465 ff.). As to the cutting of throats, it is hard to see whose it should be: surely the expression does not seem very suitable for the killing of Kresphontes Sr. (as Musso[6] 33 thought) or for the killing of Polyphontes: one usually cuts the throats of victims who are weak and in one's power (most often of women; in *HF* 319 the expression is used with regard to Amphitryon; in *Or.* 1527 with regard to the Phrygian slave; only in *Ph.* 1291 it is used of equals).

Another possibility (which would also help to explain πάρος) is that in this line something is told about Merope's mourning about the death of her sons and husband, which — like Elektra — she may have continued to the present day. The scratching of faces in mourning we find often mentioned in tragedy (e.g. A. *Ch.* 24f., E. *Hec.* 655f., *Su.* 50f., 76 [cf. Collard ad loc.], *Tr.* 280, *Hel.* 372ff., 1088f. [cf. Kannicht ad loc.], *Or.* 961f.; cf. also Tim. *Pers.* 178f. [= *PMG* 791, 166]); cf. in general E. Reiner, *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen*, Stuttgart/Berlin 1938, 44f.; G. Neumann, *Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst*, Berlin 1965, 89; M. Alexiou, *The ritual lament in Greek tradition*, Cambridge 1974, 6+n.27. Usually the object of the scratching is the παρηίς, παρειά, γένυς or πρόσωπον (cf. also the examples from figurative art mentioned by Neumann o.c. n. 365-7), but in two passages I have found the neck mentioned: *El.* 146f. κατὰ μὲν φίλαν / ὄνυχι τεμνομένα δέραν and *Il.* 19, 284f. χερσὶ δ' ἄμυσσε / στήθεά τ' ἠδ' ἁπαλὴν δειρὴν ἰδὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα (also Reiner o.c. 44 speaks about "... Frauen, die auch Wangen und Hals durch Kratzen entstellen").

Musso[6] ad loc. takes δέρην to mean 'head', referring to Dodds on *Ba.* 241. But the extended use of τράχηλος, αὐχήν and δέρη in the sense of 'head and neck', defended by J. E. Powell, CR 53, 1939, 58 is really limited to special contexts, where the neck often still plays an important part (as in contexts of decapitation; cf. for details G. P. Shipp, CR 58, 1944, 52) and the only example Powell gives of δέρη is *Ba.* 864f. δέραν / εἰς αἰθέρα δροσερὸν ῥίπτους', where it is obvious that δέρη is chosen, because by throwing their heads backwards the Maenads expose their *throats* to the air (cf. Dodds ad loc.). We have no reason to assume that our context demanded an extended use of δέρη.

]η πάρος: with]η there are of course a number of possibilities, e.g. a verb, a part. or adj. fem., an adj. going with δέρην; this last possibility is, I think, slightly more attractive than the others, because it offers a way of explaining πάρος: if the idea that the line is about Merope scratching her neck in mourning is right, and]η is part of an adj. going with δέρην, πάρος may indicate that Merope's neck could be thus qualified in the past, but not any more. For πάρος thus used cf. e.g. *Andr.* 796f. Ἰλιάδα τε πόλιν ... πάρος / εὐδόκιμον (-ος *codd.*), *Su.* 166 πολιὸς ἀνὴρ τύραννος εὐδαίμων πάρος.

Of the adjectives used of necks by Euripides εὐγενῆς and εὐφυῆς would be suitable as to their form. Yet, because of πάρος I should prefer something more transient, so perhaps εὐπρεπ]ῆ; cf. e.g. *El.* 1074f. εὐπρεπὲς / ... πρόσωπον, *IA* 822 μορφὴν εὐπρεπῆ. The contents of the line could then have been e.g. that '⟨Merope in mourning scratched⟩ her once beautiful neck'; but this is rather hypothetical.

Musso's ὁμογεν]ῆ presupposes a very different context: he thinks of a

reference to Polyphontes killing his brother Kresphontes, for which one may compare *Ph.* 1291 ὁμογενῆ δέραν (referring to Eteokles and Polyneikes).

43]ε̣ις: this could be either the preposition or part of an adj. going with ἐχθροὺς (for ἐχθροὺς cf. comm. on 36). As to the subject of ἔχει we have no clue. Considering the presumed contents of the preceding lines it may well be Merope, but this is mere guesswork.

44] ̣ας: perhaps an acc. pl. of an adj. or subst. of the third declension (ἀντιτείσετα[ι could be constructed with an acc. personae or rei), or the first person sg. of a subst. or adj. in -ας (gen. -αδος), or a subst. neutr. ending in -ας.

ἀντιτείσετα[ι: the verb also occurs in *Med.* 261 and *Su.* 1143 (ci. Canter: ἀντιτάσσομαι *L*). For the different ways in which it can be constructed, cf. LSJ s.v. τίνω II 1-6. As to its position in the sentence I can see two possibilities: (1) it is a simple statement: '... will take revenge', in which case the subject could be Kresphontes or Merope taking revenge on Polyphontes (cf. Turner[1] 80, of whose suggestions "... might be used by Cresphontes of the penalty to be exacted from Polyphontes, by Merope of the penalty to be required from either Polyphontes or the supposed murderer of her son" the second is valid only if the fragment is not from the stichomythia); (2) it was preceded by a verb + ὅπως (μή) (cf. KG 2, 372 ff., 396), in which case the line could contain a remark about somebody taking care that somebody else will (or will not) take revenge. This would fit a context about Polyphontes trying to prevent the revenge of young Kresphontes (cf. test. 5, 5 f.) or about Merope's or the speaker's expectations of Kresphontes.

45]ε ἂν γένοιτ' ἐμ̣[: the papyrus originally had]εανγενοιτοεμ̣[; subsequently a γ was written above the first ν and λλ above the second ν; then these letters were deleted again (by the original hand, I think); the second ο seems to be deleted by a stroke and a blot (by a second hand according to Austin).

Taking all this into account we have three possibilities: (1)]ε ἂν γένοιτ' ἐμ̣[, (2)]ε ἀγγέλλοιτ' ἐμ̣[and (3)]ε ἀγγέλλοιτε μ̣[: (1) and (2) are both plausible readings. It may well be that the scribe corrected his text from another text, which had the variant reading ἀγγέλλοιτο. It is not certain, however, whether this is a matter of real variants, as the different readings may be due to an assimilation-mistake, which corrupted either αγγελλοιτο into ανγενοιτο or *vice versa*. There is no way of deciding what was written by Euripides: apparently the context was such that both readings made sense, and the fact that the correction was deleted again may indicate that it was hard to decide which reading was most fitting even when the text was complete. With the present state of the text we can only observe that ἂν γένοιτο is simply too non-descript to be rejected, and ἀγγέλλοιτο might fit

one of the characters in the stichomythia (γ̄ hoping for some news?); if the fragment is not from the stichomythia, Cengarle's idea that the line is spoken by Polyphontes wishing to be told about the death of Kresphontes is a possibility (Cengarle 70).

The existence of these different readings allows a few conclusions as to the structure of the line: the supplement ἐμ̣[οί seems more likely than ἐμ̣[έ or ἐμ̣[οῦ after ἂν γένοιτο / ἀγγέλλοιτο (cf. Cengarle 70 n. 17), though, of course, some form of ἐμόϲ is also possible; if both readings made sense grammatically a single subst. or nom. cum inf.-construction (in which case the inf. might be represented by an adj. or part. only) seems to fit best.

As to (3)]ε ἀγγέλλοιτε μ̣[it is hard to see at which stage and by whom ο was deleted (though it may well be by the original hand), and for what reason. It seems a little odd if it was deleted merely in order to effect elision, as elsewhere scriptio plena occurs: therefore we must reckon with the possibility that at some stage]ε ἀγγέλλοιτε μ̣[was meant to be read (not, of course,]ε ἂν γενοιτε μ̣[which would be no Greek). Even so, the second person plural is hard to explain when we are still in the prologue, and — more important — it would be very difficult, from whatever part of the play the fragment comes, to think of a construction in which both a third pers. sg. and a second pers. pl. would make sense. So, after all, deletion for the sake of elision still seems most likely (and if it were by a second hand, we need not even blame our scribe for inconsistency). Considering all this I think that the evidence of the papyrus is strongly in favour of (1)]ε ἂν γένοιτ' ἐμ̣[.

Cengarle 70 takes ἀγγέλλοιτο as the right reading (contrary to the evidence of the papyrus) and states that this line was spoken by Polyphontes and that therefore this fragment cannot be from the prologue, in which Polyphontes did not appear, but must be from one of the early scenes, in which Kresphontes has not yet met his uncle; he then defines the speakers: "Li riterrei perciò derivati dal colloquio tra Merope e Polifonte da cui provengono anche frr. 451 e 452 N.-S.: nulla si oppone a che l'interlocutore di Polifonte sia Merope, anzi, a proposito di v. 58, il Turner fece giustamente notare: ἀντιτείϲεται might be used by ... Merope of the penalty to be required from either Polyphontes or the supposed murderer of her son". Now all this is rather weak: first of all the papyrus does not favour the idea that ἀγγέλλοιτ' is the right reading, and even though it does not follow that it was not what Euripides meant, it still makes all conclusions drawn from it rather hazardous; secondly, even if ἀγγέλλοιτ' was meant by Euripides, there is no need to give the line to Polyphontes: it could just as well be spoken by Kresphontes or his informer in the stichomythia.

46 | ἑϲτίαϲ ἴθι: this command makes it clear that fr. 2 col. I is from a scene in which more than one person is on stage. Now there are two possibilities: (1) somebody is invited to enter the house; if so, the gen. presents a problem

(reading the word as an acc. pl. would not do in this case: there is only one instance of the pl. of ἑcτία in Euripides, and there it really means a plural, i.e. *Heracl.* 144): εἴcω or ἔcω is not possible before ἑcτίαc, so we must expect some kind of periphrasis, as in e.g. *HF* 523 ὦ χαῖρε μέλαθρον πρόπυλά θ' ἑcτίαc ἐμῆc. But in a straightforward command this type of periphrasis seems a little overdone (cf. also the other instances of it: *Med.* 397, *Andr.* 593, *Tr.* 1110 f., *Or.* 1441 f.). Perhaps we may consider a description of a special part of the house (e.g. the *hospitium* to which Kresphontes was sent; cf. test. 5, 10 ff.), but then ἑcτίαc, still bearing a connotation of 'hearth, fireside' does not look like the appropriate word. If, in spite of these difficulties, somebody was still sent into the house, we may think of Kresphontes sending γ̄ inside at the end of their conversation (so Musso[6] ad loc.; cf. the dismissal of the servant in *Andr.* 91), but then it seems strange that γ̄ still goes on talking until 51. Burnett 19 thinks of Polyphontes sending Kresphontes to the *hospitium*: "And in any case, who could invite a stranger to the hearth? It would have to be someone who was a master in the house, not an ordinary servant (...). This line should belong to Polyphontes himself, and therefore the fragment should belong to a subsequent episode, when the king has come out". This, I think, is far too sweeping, though as a possibility it deserves some consideration (for a king inviting somebody into his house cf. *Heracl.* 343 ἀλλ' ἴθ' ἐc δόμουc, γέρον [Demophon to Iolaos], *Alc.* 541 [Admetus to Herakles]);

(2) somebody is ordered to go away from the house: if so, one could supply ἀφ'] ἑcτίαc ἴθι or perhaps ἄλλων πρὸc] ἑcτίαc ἴθι (cf. *Alc.* 538, *Heracl.* 144; Bond on *Hyps.* fr. 2, 4 f.). It is tempting then to think of a scene analogous to the second prologue of the *Helena*, where the old gate-keeper urges Menelaos to go away (cf. *Hel.* 450 οἶκον πρὸc ἄλλον νύν τιν' ἀντὶ τοῦδ' ἴθι): as 13 f. make it clear that Polyphontes was by no means hospitable to strangers, it is quite conceivable that γ̄ tried to persuade Kresphontes to go elsewhere at the end of the prologue.

47 If 46 was spoken by γ̄ urging Kresphontes to go away and fr. 1 col. III follows immediately on fr. 2 col. I, it is likely that γ̄ spoke this line as well. He is surely the speaker of fr. 1 col. III 1-4, and it would be odd if Kresphontes spoke this one line in reply to the command. Perhaps then, γ̄ gave some reasons for his command in these lines, as the gate-keeper does in *Hel.* 476-82; cf. also *Hel.* 1296--1300, *Hec.* 1019-1022.

fr. 1 col. III

48 ff. This column forms part of the fragment which contains the stichomythia between Kresphontes and γ̄, and the obvious conclusion is that therefore it presents a dramatic situation continuing or closely following the stichomythia. I think the fragment fits such a situation very well.

There is a dramatic siglum (ᾱ) before 52, so we may assume that 48-51, which are clearly not preceded by dramatic sigla are by another speaker. This speaker may well be γ̄: it seems a likely guess that after fr. 3 the rest of the column was used for a discussion of Merope's fate (of which fr. 2 col. I probably formed part) and that the dialogue is about to end at the top of col. III. In 52 Kresphontes (ᾱ) starts speaking, apparently in a monologue: there are no further traces of dramatic sigla or paragraphoi in 53-64 (there is a gap in the papyrus and a line lost between 58 and 59, but a dramatic siglum would—partly at least—have been visible in the preserved part of the papyrus). Mette[1] 393 saw paragraphoi beneath 59 and 64, but these are delusions of the photograph (caused by horizontal tears in the papyrus) and so is his γ̄ before 60. Cf. Turner[4] 256. From 65 onwards the left-hand margin of the papyrus is no longer preserved. That this is a solitary monologue rather than a rhesis spoken in the presence of γ̄, is suggested by the contents of the speech. Kresphontes rather gives himself away and it seems unlikely that γ̄ was present hearing all this: 52-3 show that he is shocked and wonders what he must do; in 54-5 he seems to exhort himself to take action; 56 ff. probably contained a prayer to the gods for help (see comm.).

One may wonder at the causes of Kresphontes' distress: it seems a little overdone if γ̄ had merely told him what he knew already. So perhaps we may assume that in the last part of the dialogue something new was told him (e.g. about his mother's marriage and distress, which could have been hidden from him by the *senex*; elements in 39-51 may point in this direction; for details see comm.) or that in some way his plans were thwarted (e.g. by a refusal of γ̄ to admit him to the palace; see comm. on 46). Surely it would be in accordance with Euripides' practice if something new and unexpected was added in the second part of the prologue. Cf. *Andr.* 91 ff., *Hel.* 164 ff. and 483 ff., *Or.* 126 ff., where we also find a second monologue of the person who has spoken the prologue-rhesis and subsequently got shocked by something he/she heard in a dialogue.

I think there can be little doubt about this interpretation of col. III (cf. also Webster 140; Musso[6] ad loc.). Yet attempts at other interpretations have been made, some of which even implied placing the column in a different scene.

Turner[1] 75 objected to col. III being part of the prologue for the following reasons: "Though col. III contains only the opening words of trimeters, its dramatic content seems far removed from its predecessor. Ll. 36-40 suggest a deep emotional disturbance and a heroic resolve, impossible to reconcile with a prologue or a context only 40 lines on from a prologue (to say nothing of the expected *parodos*). Moreover l. 40 ὦ νερτερα̣[looks suspiciously like fr. 456, though textual difficulties blur the identification (see notes). Fr. 456 according to Plutarch, was spoken by Merope as she took up her axe to slay

her sleeping son. But it occurred at the crisis of the play, nowhere near the prologue. Moreover according to the dramatic *siglum* l. 40 was given to actor ᾱ, the one who played Cresphontes in col. II. It is inconceivable that fr. 456 or ll. 36-40 could be spoken by Cresphontes". His solution for these difficulties was the theory that the papyrus comes from a roll which contained only extracts from the play (see intr. 3.1), an idea which was accepted by Lloyd-Jones[1] 445 as "the likeliest solution to an acute difficulty" and by Jory 67. But, as I have argued above, the contents of col. III could well follow the stichomythia and the identification of 57 with fr. 456 creates such awkward problems that the best solution seems to be to reject it (see comm. on 56 f.).

Mette[1] 394 f. states that in this column Kresphontes was recognized by γ̄, who spoke 60-64, calling him ὦ φίλτατ' in 64. This idea, however, was based on a false reading of the photograph and needs no further consideration.

Lens 257 f. accepts Turner's theory that the papyrus contained only extracts, but not the identification with fr. 456, which drove Turner to this "desperate solution". He places col. III in a scene between Merope and Kresphontes (= ᾱ), planning how to kill Polyphontes. This idea has nothing to support it.

Vysoký 15 f. (summarized in German on p. 20) interprets the column as follows: 48-51 spoken by the leader of the chorus, sympathizing with Merope; 52 ff. monologue by Merope. But his arguments are without substance, and it is certainly inconceivable that the chorus would speak in iambic trimeters to anybody before the parodos and that ᾱ = Merope here (although Vysoký tries to explain this on p. 17 f.).

48 γυνὴ δε.[: γυνὴ suggests that γ̄ is speaking either about Merope (so Mette[1] 394: "Seine letzten Worte gelten dem Schmerz und der Hoffnung der Königin"; Musso[6] 34) or making some general remark on women, inspired perhaps by Merope's sad circumstances (on gnomic conclusions of dialogues in Euripides cf. also F. Hofinger, *Euripides und seine Sentenzen*, Schweinfurt 1896, 18 ff.).

δε.[: Vysoký's supplement δέ[δοικε is excluded by the vertical trace after ε.

49 πόcιν: the accent in the papyrus is in accordance with the practice of writing an acute accent on the last syllable of a word preceding an enclitic. For examples with τε cf. Laum 293 f. Strictly speaking one would expect a double accent in such cases, but there are more instances in which the scribe omitted the first accent and only wrote the acute accent on the last syllable (e.g. *PRyl.* 1, 53 ψ 15 τιπτέμε; more examples in Laum 298). Turner's notion that with this accent ποcίν must be from ποὺc (Turner[1] 80) seems to be mistaken.

ὑ[: this leaves room for many supplements. Mette's ὑ[πονοεῖ has nothing in particular to recommend it.

δ'ε.[

50 A little scrap of papyrus containing ca· χạ[was placed in the *ed. princeps* after fr. 1 col. III 4-5. But, as can be seen also from the photograph, the letters ca· χạ[were rather out of alinement in 5 and δραcα was very unsatisfactory (Turner[1] 80 suggested reading δρῶcα; Musso[3] 153 tried δρᾶcα —from διδράcκω—of the servant running away; Mette[1] 393 tried δράcω). The fragment then was placed after fr. 1 col. III 3-4 by W. S. Barrett (apud Austin) and this was accepted by Turner[7] 125 (nr. 32). Musso[6] 34 quotes a letter written to him by Prof. Turner on the subject: "The reasons why I think it must be right are that the change: (1) would give a straight contour to the right-hand edge of the fragment, (2) avoids the need for emendation of δραcα, (3) I think physically it will go because: (α) a little tongue of ← pap. above and to the left of cα·χ.[will slide in under a damaged piece, (β) at this same tongue a prominent fibre will link, (γ) most significant: a *collema* I think runs vertically down the edge of the replaced fragment". When inspecting the papyrus I found this absolutely convincing. An additional argument may be that the little trace of ink to the right of κλαιου would fit in the left-hand edge of c in cα·χạ[, where some ink is missing.

ξέναι: obviously a nom. fem. pl. (subst. or adj.) (Musso's ξέναι δ'ἐ[πὶ χθονὶ would do only if this were a lyrical passage). As the last part of the line must have contained something going with κλαίουcα in 51 (see comm. there), the statement in which ξέναι forms (part of) the subj. cannot have been long.

51 κλαίουcα: this would be compatible with a context about Merope or women in general, but it may also refer to ȳ, who in that case was a woman. We find κλαίουcα in the same position in *IT* 55, *Hel.* 1190 (both also before a stop) and *Or.* 61 (cf. also *Hipp.* 1175 κλαίοντεc·, *Or.* 951 κλαίοντεc, οἰκτίροντεc·); like in these passages, here too it must have been preceded by some statement like 'she is/I am doing something' or 'she is/I am somewhere-/something (adj.)'. *Or.* 60f. ἔcτιν δ'ἔcω / κλαίουc'ἀδελφὴν cυμφοράν τε δωμάτων shows that such a thing could be expressed in a few words, and because of ξέναι δ'.[in 50 it seems likely that here too the statement preceding κλαίουcα was short.

χạ[: after κλαίουcα we may perhaps think of a form of χαίτη (for tearing or cutting of hair as a token of mourning or distress cf. e.g. *Alc.* 101, *Andr.* 1209, *El.* 148, *Hel.* 1187ff., *Ph.* 322f.) or χαλεπόc (cf. such expressions as *Hipp.* 259 χαλεπὸν βάροc, 769 χαλεπᾶι ... cυμφορᾶι, *El.* 1352f. χαλεπῶν/ ...μόχθων) or χαρμονή (cf. *HF* 742 χαρμοναὶ δακρύων ἔδοcαν ἐκβολάc, *Hel.* 654 ἐμὰ δὲ χαρμονὰ δάκρυα) or some form of χαίρω. After this line ȳ probably leaves the stage (see on 48ff.).

52ff. The remains of these lines (especially αἰαῖ· τί δρά[cω, ἀθλ̣[, ὦ τάλ̣[αc) can leave no doubt that the speaker is wretched. For these and similar

expressions in the context of prayers where the speaker is in distress, see Langholf 35 ff.

52 αἰαῖ· τί δρά[cω: there can be no doubt that this supplement is right. Cf. e.g. *Med.* 1042, fr. 139 (= Ar. *Th.* 1128 f., which according to Rau 88 is parody of Euripides' style rather than a literal quotation). αἰαῖ· τί δράcω; or οἴμοι· τί δράcω; is often used in tragedy as a kind of rhetorical question in a distressing situation; cf. e.g. *Alc.* 380, *Hec.* 419, *HF* 1157 and *Med.* 1271; in *Ph.* 1310 it stands at the beginning of Kreon's monologue. Often this question is followed by a second question, generally without a connective particle (cf. e.g. *Hec.* 419 οἴμοι· τί δράcω; ποῖ τελευτήcω βίον; *Med.* 1271, *HF* 1157 f., *Ph.* 1310 f., fr. 139), and sometimes linked to the first question with δέ (*Hipp.* 177, *IA* 356). It may well be that here the second question followed in 53 πῶc δ'ἀθλ̣[. If so, the rest of 52 may have been similar in structure to e.g. *Alc.* 380 οἴμοι, τί δράcω δῆτα coῦ μονούμενοc; *Ph.* 1615 εἶέν· τί δράcω δῆθ' ὁ δυcδαίμων ἐγώ; Alternatively, 52 may have contained two short questions like e.g. *Hec.* 419, in which case 53 would be the third question of the series.

53 πῶc δ': see comm. on 52.

ἀθλ̣[: a form of ἄθλιοc seems to be the likeliest supplement here: it would fit very well in a context where Kresphontes is distressed, and it is hard to find a word which is equally attractive (cf. LSJ). Now ἄθλιοc could refer to a person (e.g. Kresphontes himself, his mother, his dead father), to a state of life (e.g. βίοc, μόροc, νόcτοc, τύχη, τύχαι, κακά) or to something which causes wretchedness (cf. e.g. *Or.* 952). Besides, it is also possible that the adverb ἀθλίωc must be supplied. So the range of possibilities is wide; and, of course, it may still be that the idea of supplying some form of ἄθλιοc is wrong (ἆθλον, ἆθλοc should perhaps not be excluded).

54 ὦ τάλ̣[αc: after δεῖ c' it is likely that Kresphontes addresses himself. ὦ τάλ̣[αc fits the context very well; the contents of the line could then have been something like: 'Oh, you wretched one, you must ⟨take action now⟩'. If one supplies τάλ[αινα this must have been followed by some fem. subst., like *Med.* 1244 ὦ τάλαινα χεὶρ ἐμή, *IT* 344 ὦ καρδία τάλαινα, cf. also *Or.* 466. But in these instances τάλαινα has a connotation of 'reckless, daring' which we do not really want here (cf. J. R. Wilson, AJPh 92, 1971, 299 + n. 21). Another possibility would be ταλ̣[αίπωρε, but this is never said in a self-address in Euripides.

55 ξίφοc: perhaps Kresphontes is talking about his revenge here.

τεθη̣[: there can be little doubt that, after ξίφοc, this must be some form of θήγειν. We may read τε θη̣[and supply τε θη̣[κτόν or τε θή̣[γειν (dependent on δεῖ cε in 54). Perhaps it is more attractive to think of Kresphontes speaking about 'using a whetted sword' than about actually 'whetting it'. For the expression ξίφοc θηκτόν see comm. on fr. 453, 12. Alternatively we may

read τεθη[and supply τέθη[κται, in which case 55 probably followed 54 asyndetically; τεθῆ[χθαι however seems very difficult to construct here.

56ff. After he has given air to his distress and told himself what to do, Kresphontes now seems to start praying. The remains of his speech are scanty, but I think this interpretation accounts best for them: in 56f., 61 and 64 we have addresses (56f. clearly contains an invocation of a god; 61 may well be thus interpreted; the addressee of 64 is problematic); in 60 νῦν, εἴ ποτ'[recalls a pattern which is typical in prayers, and 62 μνηcθέν[τ and 66 κ]αὶ νῦν also may remind us of formulas characteristic of prayers (for details see comm.). For an analysis of the elements that are typical in prayers see Ausfeld 505-547; Norden 143-167; Nilsson[1] 1, 159f. (summary and literature); J. M. Bremer, in H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship*, Leiden 1981, 193ff.; on Greek hymns in general R. Wünsch in *RE* 9, 1916, 140-183 (s.v. Hymnos).

It was certainly appropriate for Kresphontes to pray to the gods for help with the difficult task of taking revenge on Polyphontes, and the end of a scene (i.c. the prologue) would be the appropriate place for such a prayer. For Euripides' habit of placing prayers at the end of a scene, where their position apparently gave them a certain extra emphasis and where the action for which the help is asked is about to begin, cf. W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, Berlin 1926, 101-4; Kannicht on *Hel.* 1093-1106; Langholf 74ff.; on prayers concluding a prologue cf. also H. W. Schmidt in Jens 25. Other examples of prayers at the end of a scene are *El.* 671ff., *IT* 1082ff., *Hel.* 1093ff., 1441ff.; cf. also A. *Th.* 69ff. (end of prologue).

For the situation of young Kresphontes praying for help in taking revenge on the murderer of his father and invoking a god in the underworld (56f.) and perhaps his dead father in 64 (but this is not certain), we have parallels in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* and the *Elektra's* of Sophocles and Euripides. In these plays we find (1) prayers to the dead father (A. *Ch.* 130ff., 479ff., E. *El.* 677; cf. also *Or.* 1225ff.), (2) prayers to the gods of the underworld, i.e. (the house of) Hades and Persephone (S. *El.* 110), Hermes Chthonios and the Erinyes (A. *Ch.* 1f., 124ff., S. *El.* 111-20; cf. also S. *Aj.* 835ff. and Ausfeld 510), (3) occasional calls on the gods of the country (S. *El.* 67) and the θεοὶ πατρῷοι (S. *El.* 411).

56f. These lines were identified by Turner[1] 75 with fr. 456. But the identification leads to several serious difficulties, textual as well as regarding the contents of col. III. The text of fr. 456 as given by Plu. *De esu carnium* 2, 5, 998 e runs as follows: †ὠνητέραν† δὴ τήνδ'ἐγὼ δίδωμί coι / πληγήν. The difference with 56f. is considerable, although there may be a way out of the difficulties if (1) we accept Porson's conjecture ὦ νέρτερ' Ἅιδη in fr. 456, 1 and believe that the scribe of the papyrus wrote elision without diastole here (as he perhaps sometimes does, see intr. 3.1), (2) we delete with Cobet πληγήν

in fr. 456, 2 as a marginal gloss (for details see comm. on fr. 456) and (3) adopt the explanation for the repetition of Ἅιδῃ in 57 which is given by Lloyd-Jones[1] 445: "Ἅιδῃ could well have occurred where Porson supposed, and then been repeated with pathetic effect at the beginning of the next line". All this may seem a little far-fetched, but I think it could just be acceptable if it were beyond doubt that the context 'required' fr. 456.

This, however, the context does not do. In fact the identification creates only problems: from the context in Plutarch it is clear that fr. 456 was spoken by Merope when she was about to attack her sleeping son with an axe. Test. 5, however, suggests that several scenes preceded this scene (at any rate a dialogue between Kresphontes and Polyphontes and between Merope and the *senex*), and even if this were not so, it would be unlikely that the axe-scene followed so closely on the stichomythia in col. II (without even room for the parodos; cf. Lloyd-Jones[1] 445, who compares A. *Ch.* for a play with an early recognition, but admits that here we should expect "some kind of choral utterance, and most probably ... one of some length").

Another problem is that the dramatic siglum ᾱ, which in fr. 1 col. II was used for Kresphontes, would now be used of Merope, whereas the roles could not be played by the same actor. Turner's theory that the papyrus contained only extracts might solve the problems regarding the sequence of the scenes, but we are still left to wonder why Merope is played by the actor ᾱ now; why she speaks about a whetted sword (or the whetting of a sword) if she is about to make an attack with an axe; how we should interpret 60 ff. in order to make them fit into this scene (I would expect that almost immediately after fr. 456 the *senex* would say something like: "Stop it! He is your son!", followed by the recognition; but 56 ff. are by one speaker [at least up to 65] and 60 ff. do not look like the required context, except perhaps 64 ὦ φίλτατε [, which in itself would very well fit a recognition-scene, but can be explained in other contexts as well). Considering all this I am confident that the best solution to all these problems is to reject the identification. Cf. also Mette[1] 391; Musso[3] 151; id.[4] 62 f.; id.[6] 35; Cengarle 67 f.; Webster 140; Austin 44; Vysoký 13.

The identification with fr. 456 being rejected, there are, I think, two things to be considered before we embark on attempts of interpretation of 56 f.: (1) should ῶ in 56 be taken as ὦ or ὧι? Turner[1] 80 remarks: "ῶ could also represent ὧι, i.e. the ξίφοc of 1. 39 (...), and the whole phrase run: ὧι νερτέραι [⏑̲ – ⏑ – ⏑̲ – ⏑ –] Ἅιδηι". But the papyrus does not seem to favour this interpretation: ὧι would be more effectively indicated by a rough breathing (so e.g. *PLond.* 733 B. 7, 8 ὥ, *POxy.* 9, 1174 col. XII 12 ὧι; cf. Laum 360). ὦ we do find sometimes written as ῶ (e.g. *POxy.* 6, 852 fr. 1 col. I 5; IV 10; *POxy.* 9, 1174 col. IV 18), though it is much more common to find it written without an accent; (2) in 57 the letters allow Ἅιδη ̣[or αἵ or αἳ δη ̣[,

but the accents are in favour of ῞Αιδη: clearly ˜ ʽ ˜ has been deleted by the same pen that wrote the thin circumflex accent on ι. An explanation for the mess on αιδη may be that first the circumflex on α was written, followed by the breathing; then the scribe may have thought that he did not want the circumflex so early and written another one, which, however, came too far to the right. Subsequently the whole lot was deleted and a new circumflex written over ι. The circumflex (which is wrong anyhow; cf. intr. 3.1) may indicate either that we should read ῞Αιδη ̣[instead of Ἀΐδη ̣[, or that we should read ῞Αιδη ̣[instead of αἵ or αἳ δη ̣[(certainly the article/rel. pronoun could not be accentuated in this way, but would be αἱ with gravis: cf. Laum 151 f.).

ὦ νερτερα̣[: apparently this is part of an invocation of 'somebody' in the underworld. It is tantalizing that the last bit of the word is lost. As it is there are two possibilities:

(1) νερτερα̣[is part of a qualification of the god(s) or person addressed (for the addition of such qualifications when addressing a god cf. Ausfeld 520 ff.; Norden 166 ff.; Langholf 51 f.; Wendel 59 f. observes that gods in tragedy are rarely addressed with their name only). If so, it may well be that 56 f. contained an invocation of Hades: 56 containing a qualification (probably dealing with his place of residence; Radt's ὦ νέρτερ' ἀ[εὶ cκῆπτρ' ἔχων is an attractive possibility), followed by his name at the beginning of 57. For this pattern cf. e.g. *Ph.* 84 f. ἀλλ', ὦ φαεννὰc οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχὰc / Ζεῦ, S. *OT* 200 ff., 903 f. Prayers to Hades are rare. As far as I can see he is only invoked by name in S. *Tr.* 1085 ὦναξ Ἀΐδη, δέξαι μ' (sc. the dying Herakles), E. *Hel.* 969 ὦ νέρτερ' ῞Αιδη, καί cὲ cύμμαχον καλῶ (where see Kannicht); S. *OC* 1556 ff.; cf. also S. *El.* 110 ὦ δῶμ' Ἀίδου καὶ Περcεφόνηc; *Il.* 9, 569 ff. (Althaia praying to Hades and Persephone for the death of her son); *Od.* 10, 533 f. = 11, 46 f.; Hes. *Op.* 465 εὔχεcθαι δὲ Διὶ χθονίωι and E. fr. inc. 912. For the reluctance to mention chthonic deities by name in prayers cf. Rohde 1, 206 ff. Webster 140 suggested that in 56 Kresphontes invoked his father in the underworld and this was accepted by Musso[6] ad loc. The line then could follow the pattern of e.g. *Or.* 1225 ὦ δῶμα ναίων νυκτὸc ὀρφναίαc πάτερ (cf. also *El.* 677) and Musso's ὦ νερτέρα̣[c ὑπὸ χθονὸc (cf. fr. 450, 1) might offer some prospects. But the drawbacks of this idea are: (a) that in that case ῞Αιδη δ̣[έ in 57 meaning 'and Hades ...' seems inescapable, but then one would expect ῞Αιδη τε rather than ῞Αιδη δέ (cf. e.g. A. *Th.* 69 ff., S. *El.* 110 ff., E. *El.* 671 ff.), (b) that it seems a little odd that he invokes first his father and then Hades, (c) that it would be difficult to find a suitable candidate for 64 ὦ φίλτατε [if his father is no longer available.

(2) νερτερα[is part of a vocative νερτέρα[ι (Austin's ὦ νέρτερ' ῞Α[ιδη? seems not very likely with ῞Αιδη following in 57). If so, we may think of the Erinyes. Like Hades they were the appropriate deities to call on in matters of

death and vengeance, especially if you wanted to take revenge on behalf of somebody who was unjustly killed (cf. Kaibel on S. *El.* 110-120; Rapp in Roscher 1, 1324 s.v. Erinys), so e.g. S. *El.* 112f. cεμναί τε θεῶν παῖδες Ἐρινύες, / αἳ τοὺc ἀδίκωc θνῄcκονταc ὁρᾶθ', *Aj.* 835-44, A. *Eu.* 94-116; cf. also E. *Or.* 316ff. They could well be addressed as e.g. ὦ νερτέρα[ι ... θεαί. Cf. e.g. *Il.* 19, 259f. Ἐρινύες, αἵ θ'ὑπὸ γαῖαν / ἀνθρώπουc τίνυνται; A. *Eu.* 71f., 115, 395; S. *OC* 106, 1568; E. *IT* 286 for comparable qualifications. In S. *OC* 1548 Persephone is called ἡ ... νερτέρα θεόc and in E. *Hel.* 969 we find ὦ νέρτερ' Ἅιδη. Another possibility with νερτέρα[ι is that Kresphontes invokes 'the world below', like Elektra addressing the home of Hades and Persephone (S. *El.* 110). Then πλάκεc may offer some prospects for completing the line. Cf. S. *OC* 1576f. νερτέραc ... νεκρῶν πλάκαc, 1564. A drawback of (2) would again be that it implies a connective δέ in 57 (see above).

58-59 Between 58 and 59 one line is lost. It may well be that Kresphontes invoked some other gods here, but there is no way of verifying this from the papyrus.

60 νῦν, εἴ ποτ'[: there can be no doubt about Turner's correction of the itacistic error. Mette's νυνί is inconceivable in a tragic text (cf. KB 1, 620, Diggle 6f.).

εἴ ποτ' recalls an element which we often find in prayers: a person who is praying may add force to his request by reminding the gods of services they have rendered in the past: "If you helped me once, you must help me now too ...". Cf. e.g. *Il.* 5, 115ff. κλῦθί μευ, αἰγιόχοιο Διὸc τέκοc, Ἀτρυτώνη, / εἴ ποτέ μοι καὶ πατρὶ φίλα φρονέουcα παρέcτηc / δηΐωι ἐν πολέμωι, νῦν αὖτ' ἐμὲ φῖλαι, Ἀθήνη; 1, 451ff.; Sappho fr. 1, 5 αἴ ποτα κἀτέρωτα ... 25 ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν (cf. D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford 1955, 17); Pi. *I.* 6, 42ff.; S. *OT* 164ff. (cf. W. Ax, *Die Parodos des Oidipus Tyrannos*, Hermes 67, 1932, 413-37). In Euripides there is an example of this pattern in *IT* 1082ff.: ὦ πότνι', ἥπερ μ' Αὐλίδοc κατὰ πτυχὰc / δεινῆc ἔcωcαc ἐκ πατροκτόνου χερόc, / cῶcόν με καὶ νῦν τούcδε τ' (where it is tempting to accept Paley's εἴπερ for the ἥπερ of the mss.; cf. Platnauer ad loc.). Here we could have the same pattern if we could link εἴ ποτ' with κ]ạὶ νῦν in 66, but (1) this would leave 60 νῦν unexplained, (2) in 61 ὑμεῖc τεα. [and 64 ὦ φίλτατε [new invocations seem to be made, so that it would be preferable to have the εἴ ποτε-pattern finished in 60. These difficulties suggest that this is rather one of those cases in which the whole idea of help-in-the-past was, as it were, put into a nutshell (so e.g. Th. 7, 70, 7 καὶ τῆc ... cωτηρίαc νῦν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὖθιc, ... ἀντιλαβέcθαι; 7, 64, 2; A. *Ag.* 520 [εἴ Auratus: ἦ *codd.*]; Ar. *Ach.* 405, *Eq.* 594, *Pax* 302, cf. also *Nu.* 356f.; D. 1, 6; cf. Ax o.c. 416; this idiom is not restricted to prayers, but also found in more general requests), or that it was followed by some short clause like A.R. 4, 757ff. Ἶρι φίλη, νῦν, εἴ ποτ'

ἐμὰς ἐτέλεσσας ἐφετμάς, / εἰ δ'ἄγε ... / δεῦρο Θέτιν μοι ἄνωχθι μολεῖν ..., but as in 61 a new group of gods seems to be invoked, the if-clause and the request then had to be very short indeed. In both cases I think we are justified in putting a comma after νῦν.

If Kresphontes has just addressed a series of gods of the underworld, his εἴ ποτ' may indicate something like: "if ever you helped a son taking revenge for his father ..."; if in the lost bit of papyrus he invoked gods whom he held responsible for some personal service to himself (e.g. his escape when he was a baby), then it would imply: "if ever you helped me ...".

61 ὑμεῖς τεα̣[: τε shows that a new group of gods is invoked (cf. on 56f.). If the Erinyes were not addressed in 56 or between 57-60, they may well be invoked here. But it is also possible that ὑμεῖς are the θεοὶ πατρῷοι (cf. S. *El.* 411, E. *Ph.* 604) or the gods of the country or town (cf. A. *Th.* 69, 109, 166ff., S. *El.* 67). So Webster 140. The idea that ὑμεῖς is addressed to the chorus (Turner[1] and Musso[6] ad loc., Vysoký 16, Mette[5] 158) is unlikely because we are still in the prologue. I expect that the last few letters on the papyrus form part of some indication of the identity of ὑμεῖς. Snell's τ'ἐάς̣[ετ' would imply that we get the imperative before we know who ὑμεῖς are, which seems less usual.

62 μνηϲθέν[τ: it is attractive to think of μνηϲθέν[τεϲ going with ὑμεῖς. If so, we may perhaps guess from the remains of the next line that something was said about 'remembering (the injustice done to) my father ...'. Cf. A. *Ch.* 491f.; Webster 140. Yet this is rather hypothetical, and it should be noted that μνηϲθέν[τ might also recall another element of prayers: the gods remembering offerings brought to them in the past. Cf. *Od.* 4, 765 τῶν (sc. offerings) νῦν μοι μνῆϲαι; *Il.* 15, 375; *h.Dem.* 64f. (cf. Richardson ad loc.); A. *Th.* 179f. φιλοθύτων δέ τοι πόλεοϲ ὀργίων / μνήϲτορεϲ ἔϲτε μοι; Lys. 2, 39; the same idea is also implied in A. *Eu.* 106ff., S. *El.* 1376ff., E. *Hel.* 969ff.; Hdt. 1, 87, 1. See Ausfeld 526ff.

63 ⟦πατροϲ̣⟧: although it is not clear why πατροϲ̣ has been deleted (Musso[6] ad loc. regards it as a repetition from the preceding line, but that is just one of several possibilities), its occurrence may give us some clue as to the context (see comm. on 62). If Kresphontes in his prayer spoke about gods who remember something and his father also figured in the context, we could e.g. think of some reference to the killing of his father or to his father's piety.

ϲφ[: in view of what I have said above I think that some form of ϲφαγή or ϲφάζω (e.g. Musso's ϲφ[αγέντοϲ) is rather attractive here (although this does not exhaust the possibilities). On ϲφαγή in Euripides cf. Bond on *Hyps.* fr. 8/9, 9.

64 ὦ φίλτατε [: Webster 140 let Kresphontes invoke Hermes here, but without offering any arguments. Certainly the invocation of Hermes would, in itself, be conceivable in Kresphontes' prayer. It could be paralleled from A.

Ch. 1 f. Ἑρμῆ χθόνιε, πατρῷι' ἐποπτεύων κράτη, / cωτὴρ γενοῦ μοι ξύμμαχόc τ'αἰτουμένωι spoken by Orestes in a similar situation (cf. also A. *Ch.* 124[b], S. *El.* 111), and Hermes could undoubtedly offer valuable help in tricky affairs like a revenge, cf. S. *El.* 1395ff. ὁ Μαίαc δὲ παῖc / Ἑρμῆc cφ'ἄγει δόλον cκότωι / κρύψαc πρὸc αὐτὸ τέρμα (where see Kaibel); *Ph.* 133; A. *Ch.* 727ff., 812ff.

The expression ὦ φίλτατε, however, seems to be against this interpretation: I could find no parallel for e.g. ὦ φίλταθ'[Ἑρμῆ in tragedy. The only instance of a god being addressed as φίλτατοc by a mortal is *Hipp.* 1092f. ὦ φιλτάτη μοι (sc. Hippolyto) δαιμόνων Λητοῦc κόρη, where the adj. stands not by itself but is closely linked with μοι δαιμόνων, indicating the special relation between mortal and god (cf. *Hipp.* 1394). The same can be said of the two other instances in tragedy where a god is referred to as φίλτατοc by a mortal (S. *Aj.* 14, E. *Tr.* 451). In E. fr. 1109, 9 both speaker and addressed are gods; in A. *Th.* 16 we find the expression γῆι τε μητρί, φιλτάτηι τροφῶι, but here the adj. seems justified by the relation implied in the words μητρί and τροφῶι; cf. also Men. fr. 287 Kö. ὦ φιλτάτη Γῆ μῆτερ; in comedy we find ὦ φίλταθ' Ἑρμῆ in Phryn. fr. 58 (1, 385 Kock), but not in a prayer; ὦ Ζεῦ φίλτατε in Ar. *Eccl.* 378 and Philemon fr. 71, 7 (2, 496 Kock) is an exclamation; nor could Ar. *Pax* 661 or 709 be compared. Now we have no indications that a special relation existed between Kresphontes and some god (and ὦ φίλτατε [μοι would be excluded by metre), so I think that the idea that Kresphontes is invoking a god here is not very likely.

The alternative is that Kresphontes is invoking his dead father; cf. e.g. *Andr.* 222 ὦ φίλταθ' Ἕκτορ (Andromache to her dead husband). For examples of prayers to dead fathers cf. intr. to 56ff.; to various dead relatives e.g. *Andr.* 222, 507f., 523ff., *Hec.* 534ff., *Tr.* 587ff. This interpretation was also offered by Musso[6] ad loc., but his ὦ φίλτατε [πάτερ must of course be rejected for metrical reasons (cf. Maas 67 [§104]). πάτερ, however, could easily have come at the end of the line or somewhere in the next line: ὦ φίλτατε [may have been followed by an indication of the father's whereabouts or sad fate (cf. *El.* 677 cύ τ' ὦ κάτω γῆc ἀνοcίωc οἰκῶν πάτερ) or by an εἴ-clause, which could e.g. express doubt as to whether the prayer would be heard (cf. *HF* 490f. ὦ φίλτατ', εἴ τιc φθόγγοc εἰcακούεται / θνητῶν παρ' Ἅιδηι, cοὶ τάδ', Ἡράκλειc, λέγω, followed by an appeal for help in 494f.; cf. also *Or.* 1231, 1241f.; Langholf 30 and Bond on *HF* 490-6) or refer to something his father had done or used to do in the past (this might be attractive in view of κ]ạὶ νῦν in 66). On ὦ φίλτατε in tragedy see further Wendel 30f., 105f.; D. B. Gregor, CR 71, 1957, 14f.

65 . .]πηcτα[: Musso's λύ]πηc is attractive, because (1) it gives an even margin, (2) it seems to fit the context, (3) the list of words in -πη in Buck-Petersen 398f. offers, as far as I can see, no other word that would fill both

these conditions equally well. Yet, we cannot be certain about the word-division and should also consider λύ]πη cτα[or λύ]πηι cτα[(cf. e.g. *Heracl.* 603 ὦ παῖδες, οἰχόμεσθα· λύεται μέλη / λύπηι·).

66 κ]αὶ νῦν μ[: for καὶ νῦν in prayers cf. the examples mentioned on 60 and Ax o.c. 416: we may have this καὶ νῦν here too, but other interpretations cannot be ruled out.

μ[: could e.g. be μ[ε, but it is also worth noticing the possibility of μ[όλ' (or μ[ολεῖν, but the imperative is more common, cf. Langholf 59): a request for the 'coming' of a god or a dead relative is common in prayers, cf. e.g. *Andr.* 509, *El.* 680, *Or.* 1231 (more examples in Langholf 59 f.; Bond on *HF* 490-6). But, of course, as we have only μ[, this by no means exhausts the possibilities. Cf. also on fr. 453, 9 ἴθι.

fr. 2 col. II

68 ff. If fr. 2 col. I has to be placed below fr. 1 col. II + fr. 3, then col. II must follow fr. 1 col. III. A possible argument against this location is that 70 ff. do not, at first sight, particularly look like a parodos. For a discussion of this objection, which I do not consider fatal, see on 39 ff.

68 It is not certain whether any letters were lost at the beginning of the line, and if so, how many. The indentation of the choral passage may well have been ca. three letters (cf. e.g. *POxy.* 18, 2161 col. II [A. *Diktyoulkoi*, II A.D.]; 8, 1083 fr. 1 [S. F **1130, II A.D.]; 6, 852 fr. 64 col. II [E. *Hyps.*, II-III A.D.]), but there is no reason why it should not have been more; cf. for indentation of 6-7 letters e.g. *POxy.* 18, 2162 fr. 2 (A., II A.D.); 27, 2452 fr. 1 (S.F **730 d, II A.D.); *PMich.* inv. 6035 (Ar. *Eq.*, II-III A.D. [ed. A. Henrichs, ZPE 4, 1969, 216-8]); *POxy.* 27, 2460 fr. 18 + 19 + 20 (E. *Telephos*, I A.D.).

69]̣εc· τὰ δ'ἄλλ' ἐπειδ̣[: the papyrus suggests that τα^{δ}αλλα must be inserted between]̣εc· and επειδ̣[. This gives as possible metrical positions ×]̣εc· or × – ⏑]̣εc· (which would imply *caesura media* with elision after ἄλλ'). In both cases there would be nothing unusual about the depth of the indentation (see comm. on 68; × – ⏑ could easily be contained in ca. 7 letters), so I can think of no way of deciding which position is more likely.

]̣εc·: this may be the second pers. sg. of a verb, either ind. or imperat. (e.g. πα]ρ̣ές· or perhaps Webster's ἔθα]ν̣ες·—in 68 the letters cυ may be the personal pronoun, but of course they may also be part of another word). Another possibility is that]̣εc· is the end of a nom. pl.

ἐπειδ̣[: this may be ἐπεὶ δ̣[(ἐπειδή or ἐπειδάν are excluded by the traces in the papyrus). If so, the subordinate clause beginning with ἐπεί must have been very short indeed, so that the main clause could be completed within this line. On the other hand ἐπειδ̣[could also be part of some form of ἐπεῖδον,

used e.g. of some god(s), although it is not easy to see which form this could be: imperat., inf. or opt. might be tractable, but would of course require ἐπιδ- (cf. e.g. A. *Suppl.* 1 Ζεὺϲ ... ἐπίδοι προϲφρόνωϲ), whereas an augmented form seems very difficult to handle here (but επειδ̣[may be due to an itacistic error).

τὰ δ'ἄλλ': we often find somebody concluding (part of) a speech or conversation with a reference to τἄλλα, i.e. the rest, which is not dealt with, or told about, or specified now; cf. e.g. *Ba.* 450 ϲοὶ δὲ τἄλλα χρὴ μέλειν, 976, *Hipp.* 523 f., *Ion* 35 f., *IT* 37, 1051; A. *Ag.* 912 f.; S. *Aj.* 865. We seem to have the same sort of ἄλλα here: it would well fit the end of Kresphontes' prayer. Perhaps then 69 contained a final command to some god, who had been mentioned before: '... and ⟨look after?⟩ the rest ...'. Such a command could just be contained by the space which is available, and could be paralleled by A. *Ch.* 579 ff., where Orestes is giving some commands to Elektra and the chorus and concludes in 583 f. τὰ δ'ἄλλα τούτωι δεῦρ' ἐποπτεῦϲαι λέγω, / ξιφηφόρουϲ ἀγῶναϲ ὀρθώϲαντί μοι, which, too, is followed by a choral ode.

There is no way of deciding whether Kresphontes remained on stage during the parodos. If he did, he must also have figured in the first scene of the first epeisodion, with a new character joining him for a dialogue (cf. H. W. Schmidt in Jens 18). We find this pattern in e.g. *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *HF.*

70 αἰαῖ· φευ[: the chorus seems to begin with a lament. The combination αἰαῖ· φεῦ does not occur elsewhere in Euripides, nor in Aeschylus, but twice in Sophocles: *OT* 1307 and *OC* 1670 (though in both cases there is some doubt about the exact text; cf. Jebb ad loc. and Dawe's apparatus). φεῦ combined with other exclamations we find in e.g. A. *Eu.* 841 οἰοῖ δᾶ φεῦ, S. *Ph.* 785 παπαῖ, φεῦ, cf. 792. Yet αἰαῖ· φευ[(being some form of φεύγω or a derivative) cannot be excluded.

71 γο[: following βαρέα this may well be some form of γοάω, βαρέα going with the object of the lament. But this does not exhaust the possibilities: forms of γοερόϲ, γόοϲ; γονή, γόνοϲ, γονεῖϲ or perhaps γόνυ are also conceivable.

72 πολυεπ̣[: as γ[offers no prospects I take the last letter to be π̣[. The only word starting πολυεπ- in tragedy has so far been πολυεπήϲ in A. *Ag.* 1133 ff. κακῶν γὰρ διαὶ / πολυεπεῖϲ τέχναι θεϲπιωιδῶν / φόβον φέρουϲιν μαθεῖν. Fraenkel ad loc. supposed, with Butler, that the meaning here lies in the direction of "fallaciae multis verborum ambagibus involutae". Of course, if the word was used here, it need not have the same deprecating connotation, as its basic meaning is 'connected with many words', which may then be used either in a neutral sense, or develop *in bonam* or *in malam partem*, either in an active or in a passive sense (cf. the use of such words as πολύμυθοϲ, εὐεπήϲ etc.). Here the sense *might* be that many words are needed to lament whatever the chorus is lamenting. Apart from A. *Ag.* 1134 the word is not attested in Greek literature.

73 μελεα δ'̣[: we have a choice between μέλεα and μελέα. If μέλεα, it could be the neuter pl. of μέλεος and a word like πάθεα could be qualified by it (cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 363, *HF* 1180, *Ph.* 1734 etc.) or it could be used as a substantive. Perhaps then it was (part of) the object of ἐκλαυσα[in the next line. μέλεα could also be the pl. of μέλος, a word which is also conceivable in a 'lamenting' context; cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 1178 δακρύων ... μέλος, *Hec.* 84 ἤξει τι μέλος γοερὸν γοεραῖς, *Hyps.* I IV 5 ff. If it was μελέα, the chorus could refer to itself if the chorus were female (cf. e.g. *Su.* 795 f. μελέα / πῶς ἂν ὀλοίμην) or to Merope or some other female or fem. subst. Finally μελεα could also represent μελέαι, written without ι- adscript.

74 ἐκλαυσα[: though several forms are possible, ἔκλαυσα [is rather attractive in a choral lament.

75 τυρανν̣[: perhaps a reference to Polyphontes or his regime, or to Kresphontes Sr., as the word need not be pejorative (see on 22 τυραννεύοι). Musso's supplements do not exhaust the possibilities.

76 τοῦ παλ[: τοῦ πάλ[αι or some form of παλαιός seems a likely supplement (the chorus referring to the 'good old days' before Polyphontes made himself king?), but also πάλιν or a compound adj. with παλιν- is possible. πατ̣[ρὸς cannot be read.

77 ̣]πολυ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[: as there appears to be room for only one letter before π̣ολυ the possibilities are limited: one can think either of some form of ἀπολύω or ὑπολύω (though neither recommends itself particularly) or of ὁ, ἁ or ὅ, ἅ or ὧ, in which case π̣ολυ̣ ̣ ̣[may be the remains of some compound adj. (forms of Πολυφόντης however are not recommended by the traces in the papyrus).

78 ὅσιον̣[: Musso[6] ad loc. wants to see here a reference to Kresphontes Sr.: "si spiegherebbe così il motivo del rimpianto", and he compares the remark on his decent behaviour in 14. All we can say is, I think, that ὅσιον may refer to the difference between Polyphontes and Kresphontes Sr., of which being ὅσιος or not may have been one aspect. Yet, other interpretations are possible.

fr. 5

85 f. Although there seems to be some ink at the edge of the papyrus before ε̣ in 85, it should be noted that the fragment may well be from the beginning of two lines. But no satisfactory join with any of the preserved middles of lines could be made.

86 ξένος: probably another reference to young Kresphontes.

PFayum + fr. 449 = 67 A

Apparently, fr. 449 was famous in antiquity. It was often quoted in

philosophical treatises and anthologies (cf. also Kassel 76), and we find line 6 being used as a kind of proverbial expression in Sen. *Apoc.* 4, 2 (where, however, the sense is inverted: the rejoicing is not because the dead is happy now, but because people are glad to be rid of him; cf. Waltz p. 20 and Russo ad loc.), Heliod. 7, 11, 9 and Plu. *Quaest. conviv.* 1, 2, 1, 615 d (where it is applied to the dismissal of somebody who is unwilling to stay at a party). Its familiarity is also apparent from the context in Men. Rhet. *Epid.* 2, 413, 27.

A comic parody of the fragment can be detected in fr. com. adesp. 1224 (3, 611 Kock), which is quoted in the app. crit.; cf. Gomperz 1, 254f. In one of its sources this fragment is attributed to Euripides (cf. E. fr. dub. et spur. 1112), but the Attic spelling in line 2 suggests comedy (there are some textual difficulties, but no reason to change the double τ; cf. Nauck and Kock ad loc.); besides, the verb κατορύττω is found only in prose and comedy (cf. LSJ s.v.), which is another, though not decisive, argument in favour of the comic origin of the lines. In attributing this fragment to Euripides somebody may have been misled by its similarity to the famous lines in the *Kresphontes*. For another possible comic echo see comm. on 6.

Another reminiscence of our fragment might be detected in *PFlinders Petrie* 1, 9 fr. 1, 5-9 (quoted in app. crit.), which, apparently, is from a description of νόμιμα βαρβαρικά, like those of Aristotle and others (cf. Mahaffy ad loc.). Even though the lines are mutilated it is clear that the description was similar in structure to our fragment. Cf. also: 6 θρηνειν[; 8-9 ωc πολλω[ν καματων? / αναπεπαυμεν[ων (and it may be worth noticing that ὡc is recorded as a variant also in fr. 449, 3). Attempts to supply the papyrus fragment with the help of fr. 449 have been made by O. Crusius, Phil. Suppl. 6, 1891-1893, 297 and Rohde 2, 34 n. 1.

The pessimistic view of life which we find in this fragment often recurs in Greek literature. Cf. e.g. *Il.* 17, 446f., *Od.* 18, 130f., Simon. fr. 520 Page, Hdt. 7, 46, 2-3 etc. The idea that it is better not to be born (and, if so, to die as soon as possible) we find in e.g. Thgn. 425-8, B. 5, 160-2, S. *OC* 1224ff., E. fr. 285, 1-2 ἐγὼ τὸ μὲν δὴ πανταχοῦ θρυλούμενον / κράτιcτον εἶναι φημὶ μὴ φῦναι βροτῶι, fr. 908, 1, Alexis fr. 141, 14-16 (2, 348 Kock), Arist. fr. 44 Rose; see further Maehler on B. 5, 160-162. For death as a refuge from the miseries of life cf. also Hdt. 7, 46 (and the well-known story of Kleobis and Biton in Hdt. 1, 31), A. fr. 353, E. *Tr.* 268ff., *TrGF* 2 F 369, 371. On this 'Greek pessimism' in general see W. Nestle, *Der Pessimismus und seine Überwindung bei den Griechen*, NJb 47, 1921, 81-97; on this type of utopian wishes in Euripides Solmsen 66ff.

For a habit of mourning people's birth and celebrating their death we can compare Hdt. 5, 4, 2 (about the Trausi, a Thracian tribe) τὸν μὲν γενόμενον περιιζόμενοι οἱ προcήκοντεc ὀλοφύρονται, ὅcα μιν δεῖ ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἀναπλῆcαι κακά, ἀνηγεόμενοι τὰ ἀνθρωπήια πάντα πάθεα, τὸν δ' ἀπογε-

νόμενον παίζοντές τε καὶ ἡδόμενοι γῆι κρύπτουσι, ἐπιλέγοντες ὅσων κακῶν ἐξαπαλλαχθείς ἐστι ἐν πάσηι εὐδαιμονίηι. The similarity between this passage and fr. 449 concerns not only the subject-matter, but there is also a close resemblance in the structure of the sentence, whereas the verbal echoes and variations seem to be too many to be accidental (for details see comm.). The idea that the passages merely deal with the same topos (so J. Wells, *Studies in Herodotus*, Oxford 1923, 187) or are derived from a common source (so Schmid *GGL* I, 3, 396 n. 3) or that Euripides got the idea from Sophistic literature (so F. Dümmler, *Kleine Schriften I*, Leipzig 1901, 212 n. 1) does not account for these verbal resemblances; cf. also Cengarle 73; Di Benedetto 131 + n. 3; Solmsen 71; J. Cobet, Hermes 105, 1977, 16. Of course this does not imply that Herodotus was the first and only author who wrote about this habit before Euripides.

A relation between the two passages being granted it seems most likely that Euripides is dependent on Herodotus: Herodotus tells a 'historical fact', which is then adapted by Euripides to fit a statement on the sadness of life. Cf. R. Browning, CR 75, 1961, 201-2, whose line of argument I have mainly followed (but doubtful about his conclusions C. W. Fornara, JHS 91, 1971, 25 + n. 3). Whether or not Herodotus tells a real historical fact, is of course hard to decide. The same habit is recorded of other Thracian tribes (i.e. the Krobyzoi and the Kausianoi; references in Rohde 2, 34 n. 1), and it is regarded as real by e.g. G. Kazarow, *RE* 6 a, 1937, 549 (s.v. Thrake) (who , in support of his view, some years later adduced an Arab record about East-Slavonic tribes [IX A.D.] who used to rejoice when they burnt their dead; cf. G. Kazarow, *Zu Herodotus V 4*, PhW 60, 1940, 410 f.); Musso[6] ad loc. (who suggests Hecataeus as common source); C. M. Danov, *Altthrakien*, Berlin/New York 1976, 172. Another explanation is offered by Nestle o.c. 86: "Im V. Jahrh., als die romantische Verherrlichung der Naturvölker aufkam, übertrug man dann solche der gewöhnlichen Anschauung zuwiderlaufende Überzeugungen auf barbarische Stämme"; and by Aly 141: "Das wahrscheinlichste ist, dass ein tatsächlich beobachteter Brauch in griechischem Sinne umgedeutet ist" (i.e. a habit of not showing joy at births in order to mislead bad demons). Older literature on the subject is listed by C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* 2, Reg. Pruss. 1829, 801 ff.

A remark about mourning at child-birth and rejoicing at funerals has also been attributed to Hesiod: Hieron. *Ep.* 60, 14 *et Hesiodus natales hominum plangens gaudet in funere* (= Hes. fr. spur. 377 M-W). No such passage of Hesiod, however, has been preserved and it seems possible that *Hesiodus* here is a mistake for *Herodotus* (this kind of confusion also in Hes. fr. spur. 364 and 368 M-W), although the formulation is a little careless if the passage refers to Hdt. 5, 4, 2. Cf. Labourt's note on Hieron. *Ep.* 60, 14 (p. 224 of his edition) for a discussion of the problem. (Mette[5] 161 takes *Hesiodus* as a mistake for *Euripides*).

A firm statement about the context of the fragment is impossible. It looks like part of a rhesis, and the pessimistic tone may well be caused by the sad circumstances which form the background of the *Kresphontes*. It may have been spoken by one of the major characters (e.g. Merope), but would also fit a minor character (e.g. the *senex*): 'lower class' people sometimes take to philosophizing in Euripides; cf. e.g. the old man in *Hel.* 711-33, 744-57; the nurse in *Hipp.* 433-81; further on this habit Mannsperger in Jens 155; Brandt 19. The chorus is not, I think, among the candidates; although spoken utterances of the chorus containing four or more lines do occur in Euripides (a quick glance at the preserved plays led to a result of 14 × 4, 3 × 5, 1 × 8 [*Ph.* 280 ff.], 1 × 13 [*Hel.* 317 ff.] lines and probably one rhesis of 23 lines in *HF* 252 ff., on which see Bond ad loc.), they tend to be of a different character: they usually contain a reaction after a rhesis of one of the characters in the play, admitting that it is all very sad (e.g. *Heracl.* 232-5; *Andr.* 421-4). Clearly fr. 449 is of a different nature.

Attempts to locate the fragment were made by Welcker 2, 832; Hartung 2, 49; Wecklein 5 (beginning of play; Merope); Basedow 25 ff. (part of Merope's lament when she has heard of her son's death); Webster 142 (Merope persuading Polyphontes as part of the mechanema); Vysoký 11 (reflection on the 'civil war'; probably not by Merope); Musso[6] ad loc. — following Bothe 158 — argues that the chorus is speaking at the end of the second epeisodion, because of (1) χ[in *PFayum* (but see intr. 3.2), (2) ἡμᾶϲ in 3 (but that may be used in a general way). The impossibility of locating the fragment is admitted by Calderini 563 f.; Solmsen 71.

Welcker 2, 832 f. tried to construct a rhesis by Merope out of E. fr. inc. 908 + E. fr. 908 a Snell and E. fr. *908 b Snell (quoted in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 3, 22) + fr. 449 (quoted in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 3, 15, 2), arguing that Clemens had written out a rhesis on the undesirability of procuring children. The context in Clemens, however, rather suggests that he gathered passages from several plays (or used a source who had already done so) in order to prove his point. Besides, fr. 449 does not necessarily come from a context about bearing children. Welcker's idea was accepted by Basedow 27 f. and (partly) by Hartung 2, 49; cf. also Wecklein 6 f., Nauck p. 497; contra Wagner 848; cf. app. 1 B 3.

2 χ[: see intr. 3.2.

3 ἐχρῆν: in a utopian passage like this the 'subjective' ἐχρῆν ('[I think] we ought to ...') is preferable to the 'objective' ἔδει; cf. also Solmsen 72 on "the typical χρῆν, a statement of what ought to be the case" in utopian wishes. On the difference between χρή and δεῖ see in general G. Redard, *Recherches sur ΧΡΗ ΧΡΗϹΘΑΙ, étude sémantique*, Paris 1953, 55-62; S. Bernardete, *ΧΡΗ and ΔΕΙ in Plato and Others*, Glotta 43, 1965, 285-298. The variant ἔδει may have arisen when the distinction was no longer felt or when δεῖ became more

usual than χρή in spoken language (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 41). As to the actual form ἐχρῆν: this is guaranteed by metre 19× in Euripides (against χρῆν 65×), so there would be nothing very exceptional about it here. On χρῆν/ἐχρῆν cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 1072-3; M. Platnauer, *XPHN: EXPHN*, CR 56, 1942, 2-6. For ἐχρῆν referring to the present cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 297 τί cιγᾷc; οὐκ ἐχρῆν cιγᾶν, τέκνον, *Or.* 1030 ζῆν ἐχρῆν c', ὅτ' οὐκέτ' εἶ, fr. 908 a, 2 Snell, 1048, 6, 1109, 2; KG 1, 205; Schwyzer 2, 308, 4.

γὰρ: this must have linked the lines to what was preceding; μὲν (Stob *S*) is best regarded as an adaptation to the style of the anthology (cf. Luria 88 f.).

cύλλογον ποιουμένουc: surely cύλλογον must be the right reading: the expression occurs twice in Euripides (*Heracl.* 335, fr. 282, 14) and several times in Herodotus and Thucydides (med. or act. e.g. Hdt. 7, 8 [init.]; 8, 83, 1; Th. 1, 67, 3; 2, 59, 3; 4, 114, 3), always with the singular. A cύλλογοc is usually an assembly on a fairly large and 'official' scale (of citizens in *Heracl.* 335, *Or.* 730; of the Greek army in *IA* 514, 825, 1545; of the gods in *Hel.* 878; cf. also the passages from Hdt. and Th.). If we compare this expression with the corresponding words in Hdt. 5, 4, 2 περιιζόμενοι οἱ προcήκοντεc, it is tempting to think that Euripides made a deliberate change: not only the relatives must bewail the new-born child, but a whole assembly of people must join in (Cengarle 73, who found the words superfluous, seems to have missed this point).

4 τὸν φύντα: there can be little doubt that this reading must be preferred to the variants ζῶντα and φῶτα, as (1) it is suggested by Hdt. 5, 4, 2 τὸν μὲν γενόμενον and by Cicero's interpretation *ubi esset aliquis in lucem editus*, (2) εἰc ὅc'ἔρχεται κακά neatly elaborates the idea of motion implied in φύντα and the line as a whole evokes the notion of 'birth as a journey towards misery' (these arguments were already used to defend φύντα by H. Stephanus, *Ciceronianum Lexicon Graecolatinum...*, Parisiis 1557, 198 [second series of pages]). With ζῶντα I can see no point in ἔρχεται: it looks as if the word has been inserted at a later stage, by someone who wished to create a more distinct contrast with 5 θανόντα and ignored the impact of ἔρχεται and the fact that crying and rejoicing suggest a contrast between *birth*—not just life—and death.

θρηνεῖν εἰc ὅc' ἔρχεται κακά: after verbs expressing an emotion we often find this type of "subordinated exlamatory construction" (Dale on *Hel.* 74), introduced by ὡc, οἷοc, ὅcoc instead of the 'expected' ὅτι + demonstr. Cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 1079 ἐδάκρυc' οἷα πάcχομεν κακά, *Andr.* 994, *Hel.* 74 (where see also Kannicht); KG 2, 370, 9. Hdt. 5, 4, 2 uses a similar construction: ὀλοφύρονται, ὅcα μιν δεῖ ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἀναπλῆcαι κακά.

5 καὶ πόνων πεπαυμένον: Wecklein 5 n. 2 wanted to read κἀκ πόνων instead of the generally accepted καὶ πόνων, comparing *Med.* 46, *El.* 1108, fr. 105, 2, S. *El.* 231 (cf. also Ar. *Ra.* 1531). But the gen. without preposition

can be paralleled from e.g. *Tr.* 524 πεπαυμένοι πόνων, *Ba.* 1360 οὐδὲ παύcομαι κακῶν, *Alc.* 938, *Ph.* 437. So there is no reason to change the text.

The variant ὡc is of course unacceptable because of the hiatus. One may wonder whether a text containing ὡc was at the background of *PFlinders Petrie* 1, 9 fr. 1, 8.

The expression πόνων πεπαυμένον fits the context very well. In itself the idea that death meant freedom from misery was commonplace and the expression need not convey much more than simply 'dead'; for the popularity of the expression in funeral epigrams cf. A. M. Zumin, in *Studi ... L. A. Stella*, Trieste 1975, 369. On the thought cf. also Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Supp.* 802-3.

6 χαίροντας εὐφημοῦντας: for this type of asyndeton, where the second verb often is explanatory of the first, cf. e.g. *El.* 855 χαίροντες ἀλαλάζοντες, *Hel.* 371 ⟨ἐ⟩κελάδηcεν ἀνοτότυξεν, *Or.* 951 κλαίοντες οἰκτίροντες, S. *Ph.* 11 βοῶν cτενάζων etc.; Bruhn 86 f., Kannicht on *Hel.* 930, Bond on *HF* 602. Here εὐφημοῦντας indicates that the joy must be expressed by cheerful cries, and perhaps songs, so that this ideal funeral proves to be quite the opposite of a normal funeral, which is δύcφημος (cf. Hes. *Op.* 735 δυcφήμοιο τάφου, where the adj. may refer to "the inauspicious sounds of mourning which attend it" [West ad loc.]; for δυcφημέω relating to laments cf. also *Hec.* 180 f., S. *El.* 1181 f.).

For εὐφημέω in the sense 'to express joy at a festive occasion' cf. A. *Ag.* 595 f. ὀλολυγμὸν ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν κατὰ πτόλιν / ἔλαcκον εὐφημοῦντες, Ar. *Pl.* 757 f. οἱ δ' ἠκολούθουν κατόπιν ἐcτεφανωμένοι / γελῶντες, εὐφημοῦντες (perhaps an echo of our fragment? the passage is not mentioned by Rau, who does however regard 758 f. as paratragic [Rau 167]) and D.S. 5, 49, 1 τοὺc δ' ἄλλους θεοὺc εὐφημοῦντας cυναυξῆcαι τὸν γάμον; also, with the expression of the joy as subject A. *Pers.* 389, *Ag.* 28.

Cicero apparently took the word to mean 'praising' (*laude*), but although this meaning is not inconceivable (cf. Plb. 31, 3, 4 and perhaps Pi. *P.* 10, 35, E. *Tr.* 1072), it seems not so much to the point here: we are not concerned with the good qualities of the deceased, but simply with their good luck in being dead. Besides, it fits the reversal of the normal proceedings far better if we take εὐφημοῦντας to be the exact opposite of δυcφημοῦντας, i.e. to mean 'rejoicing'. If we take εὐφημοῦντας as 'praising' this contrast gets lost: after all, one could praise somebody at sad funerals as well. We may compare Iphigeneia's instructions before she is killed in *IA* 1466 ff. οὐκ ἐῶ cτάζειν δάκρυ. / ὑμεῖc δ' ἐπευφημήcατ', ὦ νεάνιδες, / παιᾶνα τἠμῆι cυμφορᾶι Διὸc κόρην / Ἄρτεμιν· ἴτω δὲ Δαναΐδαιc εὐφημία.

χαίροντας εὐφημοῦντας corresponds to Hdt. 5, 4, 2 παίζοντές τε καὶ ἡδόμενοι, though it may be that εὐφημοῦντας also covers ἐπιλέγοντες ... εὐδαιμονίηι (but see comm. on 7 ff.).

ἐκπέμπειν δόμων: ἐκπέμπειν must refer to the burial procession (cf. Cicero's *exsequi*) and therefore be synonymous here with ἐκφέρειν (cf. e.g. *Il.* 24, 786 καὶ τότ' ἄρ' ἐξέφερον θρασὺν Ἕκτορα, E. *Alc.* 716 ἀλλ' οὐ cὺ νεκρὸν ἀντὶ coῦ τόνδ' ἐκφέρειc, Hdt. 7, 117, 1 ἐξενεῖκαί τε αὐτὸν κάλλιcτα καὶ θάψαι). I found no other examples of ἐκπέμπειν being used in this way (the many parallels Musso[6] ad loc. quotes for ἐκπέμπειν δόμων all refer to sending somebody or something out of the house literally). Still, if one bears in mind that a πομπή can be a solemn procession (cf. LSJ s.v. II), the word presents no real difficulties, and the use of ἐκπέμπειν here may be due to Euripides' desire to avoid the common and 'technical' term ἐκφέρειν. With 5-6 one may compare Hdt. 5, 4, 2 τὸν δ' ἀπογενόμενον ... εὐδαιμονίηι (cf. intr. to this fr.).

7 ff. If *PFayum* is from an anthology we cannot be sure that these lines are from the *Kresphontes* as well. If they are, I wonder whether we may infer from]ωτατοι[, which could be superl., in 7, that line 7 contained some sort of elaboration of what was said in the preceding lines, like ἐπιλέγοντεc ... ἐν πάcηι εὐδαιμονίηι in Hdt. 5, 4, 2: a superl. would somehow recall these words of Herodotus. Such an elaboration could have been left out by people who quoted 3-6 for moral purposes, as it did no damage to the sense. But of course it may well be that the letters must be divided differently, e.g.]ω̣ τα τοι[or]ω̣τα τοι[.

fr. 450 = 68 A

Although the fragment is generally regarded as being from the *Kresphontes* (only Hartung 2, 46 placed it in *Temenidai*), the context in Plutarch leaves room for some doubt: it may well be that Kresphontes Sr. was a character in one of the other Heraclid plays of Euripides (cf. test. 1 and 3; app. 1 C 1; 2 C 1 and my article in ZPE 35, 1979, 13 + n. 21; also app. 1 C 2 seems to refer to a tragic representation of Kresphontes Sr.) and that it was he who spoke these lines. There is nothing in the text of the fragment itself to 'prove' that it belongs to the *Kresphontes*.

Various suggestions have been made as to the location of the fragment in the play. Except for Welcker 2, 831, who took the speaker to be the ghost of Kresphontes Sr. (an idea which was rejected by Basedow 17: "non intellego, quomodo de defuncto defunctus haec dicere potuerit"!), all scholars agreed that young Kresphontes spoke these lines. Welcker 2, 831, K. Schwenk, RhM 2, 1843, 456, Wagner 727, Wecklein 15 and Basedow 17 all placed the fragment in the prologue. Musso[6] ad loc. says that this is now ruled out by the new papyrus-fragments, but of course our fragment could well be from the part of the prologue which is still lost (e.g. if Kresphontes spoke the prologue-rhesis he could mention his descendance from Herakles; for the

slightly sceptical tone cf. e.g. *Hel.* 17-21; *Or.* 8; fr. 14, 1). Other suggestions have been made by Calderini 564 (from a distichomythia; but the fragment does not look like a self-contained answer and, besides, distichomythia is rare in Euripides; cf. Seidensticker in Jens 209); Vysoký 8 and 19 and Musso[6] ad loc. (dialogue Polyphontes-Kresphontes); Webster 142 (Merope and Kresphontes planning the mechanema).

All we can say is that some Kresphontes is musing on Herakles' power (possibly: to help him [cf. Schmid *GGL* I 3, 396 n. 5] or somebody else): if he is dead, not much can be expected (but if he is on Olympus, he may be useful: the μέν-clause may suggest such an implication; cf. Webster 142).

1 νερτέρας ὑπὸ χθονὸς: the sense demands that we take ὑπό here to mean 'below in the underworld'. For ὑπό thus used in a 'pregnant' sense cf. such expressions as *Il.* 22, 482 (*al.*) ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης, and the use of the Latin *sub* in e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3, 11, 29 *sub Orco*, Verg. *A.* 4, 243 *sub Tartara*. For the expression νερτέρας ... χθονὸς cf. *HF* 335 νερτέραι δώσων χθονί and perhaps *Alc.* 47 κἀπάξομαί γε νερτέρων (-αν *P 1*) χθόνα (Dale ad loc. defends νερτέρων as *lectio difficilior*, but I cannot understand her arguments).

The current belief in V B.C. was that Herakles, after his death, went to Olympus and married Hebe. We find this as early as Homer and Hesiod (but cf. West on Hes. *Th.* 947-55 on the athetesis of some of these passages in scholia, possibly because of their contents; cf. also M. Muehl, RhM 101, 1958, 117 ff.). Two passages in Homer presuppose a tradition that Herakles died and went to Hades (*Il.* 18, 117 ff. and *Od.* 11, 601 ff., where 602-4 may be an interpolation inserted in order to make the passage fit in with the later tradition of Herakles' apotheosis; cf. E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften* 2, Tübingen/Leipzig 1901, 281). It seems likely that this was an earlier tradition, preceding that of his deification (cf. L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero cults and ideas of immortality*, Oxford 1921, 98). I have found no later allusions to this idea, apart from *Heracl.* 910-16 ἔστιν ἐν οὐρανῶι βεβα/κὼς τεὸς γόνος, ὦ γεραι/ά· φεύγει λόγον ὡς τὸν Ἅι/δα δόμον κατέβα, πυρὸς / δεινᾶι φλογὶ σῶμα δαισθείς· / Ἥβας τ' ἐρατὸν χροΐζει / λέχος χρυσέαν κατ' αὐλάν, where the chorus alludes to a 'story' that Herakles went to Hades and then rejects it (cf. *Heracl.* 9 f.).

2 οὐδὲν ἂν σθένοι: the idea that Herakles, if he is dead, may be powerless, is a logical inference from the conception of the dead as being nothing, which we sometimes find in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Alc.* 381, fr. 532. This ineffectiveness of the dead is also hinted at in *Hel.* 965 (Menelaos praying to Proteus:) οἶδ' οὕνεκ' ἡμῖν οὔποτ' ἀποδώσεις θανών. Yet, in other passages people express the hope that the dead may help them (cf. the prayers to dead relatives mentioned in the comm. on fr. 66, 64 A) or a hero may bless a city from the grave (so Eurystheus in *Heracl.* 1032 ff.). Cf. on these 'inconsistencies' Rohde 2, 250 ff.

fr. 451 = 69 A

This fragment has generally and plausibly been regarded as part of an agon between Merope and Polyphontes (so Basedow 18 f., Wecklein 8, Cengarle 75, Webster 141, Vysoký 9), though some scholars attributed it to the scene where Merope pretends to be reconciled to Polyphontes (Welcker 2, 836; Musso[6] ad loc.); for details see comm. on 1-2.

For *fratrem* and *fratris uxor* in Gellius, which worried Wecklein 8 n. 2 and Basedow 20, cf. test. 6, 3 and now also fr. 66, 16 A: these passages make it certain that Polyphontes must be regarded as a Heraclid, and as such he could well be a brother of Kresphontes Sr. The fact that the mythographers only mention Temenos, Aristodemos and Kresphontes as sons of Aristomachos does not seem fatal to this, and the form of the names Kres-phontes and Poly-phontes supports the idea that they were brothers; cf. intr. 2.1. Therefore, there is no need to accept the suggestions of Basedow (*fratrem* is a mistake of Gellius) or Wecklein (Polyphontes is a νόθοϲ παῖϲ of Aristomachos — he may have been, of course, but we have no reason to assume it).

1 εἰ γάρ: this suggests that the fragment is from an argumentation of some length, and not from a distichomythia as Cengarle 75 thought; cf. also intr. to fr. 450.

1-2 ἔμελλεν ... μέλλειν: for the interpretation of both forms of μέλλειν we have to depend on the context of the fragment: 1 is best regarded as a short summary of Polyphontes' defence and related to *cum Polyphontes rex propterea se interfecisse fratrem diceret, quod ipse ante de nece eius consilium cepisset*, so that we must take ἔμελλεν primarily as 'was about to' (LSJ s.v. II), recalling *consilium cepisset*. For μέλλειν in 2 we have a clue in Tiro's remark which follows the quotation *at hoc enim ... plane stultitiae plenum est eo consilio atque ea fini facere uelle aliquid, uti numquam id facias, quod uelis*, where *eo ... uelis* is best regarded as a paraphrase of μέλλειν, so that the word can be rendered by 'fail to carry it out, put off' (cf. LSJ s.v. III). Now καί in 2 suggests that ἔμελλεν and μέλλειν bear the same meaning (cf. Cengarle 71; Mette[5] 158), and apparently ἔμελλεν, though primarily 'was about to', must at the same time be taken to mean 'put off'. This word-play is obviously referred to by *hisce adeo eum uerbis eluserit*; cf. also Basedow 19, Wecklein 8 f. For similar word-play with μέλλειν cf. D. 6, 14 f. οὐκοῦν φαϲὶ μὲν μέλλειν ... (15) ὁ δὲ ταῦτα μὲν μέλλει καὶ μελλήϲει γ', ὡϲ ἐγὼ κρίνω, τοῖϲ Μεϲϲηνίοιϲ δὲ καὶ τοῖϲ Ἀργείοιϲ ἐπὶ τοὺϲ Λακεδαιμονίουϲ ϲυλλαμβάνειν οὐ μέλλει (where see Rehdantz-Blass).

With this interpretation the fragment fits well into the context of Tiro, who is defending the rightness of attacking before you get attacked yourself and obviously considered the advice to put it off (χρῆν in 2 is modal imperf. as in fr. 449, 3) as madness (*stultitiae plenum*). Within the context of the *Kres-*

phontes it is quite conceivable that the lines were spoken by an angry Merope in an argument with Polyphontes.

ὡς σὺ φῄς: cf. *cum ... diceret* in the context. Apparently Polyphontes had argued that he had acted in self-defence when killing Kresphontes Sr. Whether or not this excuse had been entirely invented by him we have no means of knowing. Surely γ̄ in fr. 66, 22 A gives a different account of his motives and so does test. 7, 5.

κτείνειν: Nauck preferred κτενεῖν, which suggests an intention for the more distant future, whereas the inf. praes. indicates an intention which is going to be fulfilled immediately. Yet, this distinction after μέλλω cannot always be drawn so sharply (cf. KG 1, 179) and without context it seems rash to change the text here. Even if the plans of Kresphontes Sr. were meant for a more distant future, it may be that Merope here recalls the view of Polyphontes, who regarded them as an immediate danger, and then the inf. praes. fits very well. Cf. *Andr.* 68 f. τὸν παῖδά σου μέλλουσιν ... / κτείνειν, where the excited servant uses the inf. praes., whereas Andromache later refers to the same intention with an inf. fut. (407, 571).

2 ὡς χρόνος παρήλυθεν: 'when time had passed', sc. without you being killed by him: if we take μέλλειν in the sense of 'put off, fail to carry it out' this explanation immediately suggests itself and changes become unnecessary. For the expression cf. e.g. *Ion* 15 ὡς δ'ἦλθεν χρόνος; for this use of παρέρχομαι e.g. fr. 1028, 2 τόν τε παρελθόντ' ἀπόλωλε χρόνον (more examples in LSJ s.v. I 2). This form of the aorist, well-known from epic and lyric poetry, is also sometimes found in Euripides' lyrics and occasionally in dialogue (e.g. *El.* 598 καίριος γὰρ ἤλυθες, *Tr.* 374); cf. Denniston on *El.* 168; Bond on *HF* 395.

Also palaeographically παρήλυθεν is the most satisfactory solution: it is a simple correction of *V*'s παρηαλυθὲν, whereas παρῆν δῆθεν in *recc.* may be nothing more than a late and unmetrical attempt at emendation of παρηαλυθεν (cf. Marshall p. xviii on ς = *recc.* + *ed. princ.*; differently Cengarle 71 n. 22).

fr. 452 = 70 A

It is generally and probably rightly believed that these lines were spoken by Polyphontes, defending himself. The fragment is usually placed in the same scene as fr. 451, which is attractive, but not cogent. Surely the lines would go nicely with the kind of self-defence that is suggested for Polyphontes by fr. 451 + context.

1 πέπονθ' ὅπερ πάντες βροτοί: for this expression cf. fr. 1077 πέπονθας οἷα χἄτεροι πολλοὶ βροτῶν, *IA* 366, *Heracl.* 176 ff.; LSJ s.v. πάσχω II 2.

2 φιλῶν ... ἐμαυτὸν: the idea that everybody loves himself best often

recurs. Cf. e.g. *Med.* 86 ὡς πᾶς τις αὑτὸν τοῦ πέλας μᾶλλον φιλεῖ, Pl. *Lg.* 731 e τοῦτο δ'ἔστιν ὃ λέγουσιν ὡς φίλος αὑτῶι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος φύσει ... ἔστιν, Men. *Mon.* 814, Ter. *Andr.* 426f., Marc. Ant. *Heaut.* 12, 4; cf. also S. *Aj.* 1366; W. A. Heidel, *Charity that begins at home*, AJPh 30, 1909, 196-198; Strömberg 40. By saying that he is not ashamed of loving himself, because everybody does it, Polyphontes implicitly admits that his φιλαυτία is a bad thing, thus conforming himself to the common view about φιλαυτία. Only occasionally we find it positively valued; cf. S. *OC* 309 τίς γὰρ ἐσθλὸς (ἔσθ' ὃς Nauck) οὐχ αὑτῶι φίλος; (+ Jebb ad loc.) and E. *Hel.* 998f. ἐγὼ πέφυκά τ' εὐσεβεῖν καὶ βούλομαι, / φιλῶ τ'ἐμαυτήν (+ Kannicht's interpretation; a different interpretation is given by H. G. Ingenkamp, WS N.F. 5, 1971, 74ff.). For a discussion on 'good' and 'bad' φιλαυτία see Arist. *EN* 9, 8, 1168 a 28-1169 b 2.

fr. 453 = 71 A

This ode to Peace must have had a very special appeal to the Athenian public during the Peloponnesian war, as it is likely that it recalled to them their own situation (though I do not think that one should go as far as Di Benedetto 133, who wants to regard this ode as a warning against civil strife as it took place in Corcyra in 427 B.C.). But, surely, that must have been an additional bonus: the ode must first of all refer to the action of the *Kresphontes*. For evidence of its popularity cf. (1) the parody in Ar. *Georgoi* fr. 109 (1, 419 Kock) Εἰρήνη βαθύπλουτε καὶ ζευγάριον βοεικόν, / εἰ γὰρ ἐμοὶ παυσαμένωι τοῦ πολέμου γένοιτο / σκάψαι κἀποκλάσαι τε καὶ λουσαμένωι διελκύσαι / τῆς τρυγὸς ἄρτον λιπαρὸν καὶ ῥάφανον φαγόντι; cf. H. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*, Stuttgart-Berlin 1937, 91f.; Rau 148 n. 28, and (2) the story in Plb. 12, 26, 5 = Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 22, where we are told how Hermocrates quoted fr. 453, 1-7 in a speech at the peace-congress in Gela (on implications for the date of the *Kresphontes* see intr. 1.1).

Praise of peace we find as early as Hes. *Th.* 902f., *Op.* 228; more elaborately B. *Pae.* 4, 61ff., E. *Su.* 488ff., Ar. *Pax* 974ff., Philemon fr. 71, 7ff. (2, 496f. Kock). On the utopian character of this kind of praise cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1151-64; for passages illustrating Euripides' 'love of peace' Nestle[1] 310f.

The ode as far as we have it shows a structure which is characteristic of prayers, beginning with the *invocation* (1-3), followed by the *argument* (4-8), which gives the reasons for the request, and by the actual *petition* (9ff.); for the terminology cf. J. M. Bremer, in H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship*, Leiden 1981, 194ff., who, with some modifications, follows Ausfeld 515ff.

Opinions as to the background of this fragment vary. Welcker, Webster

and Vysoký let it refer to civil war, but had different views as to the nature of this civil war: Welcker 2, 831 thought of a feud between the aristocrats and the people (comparing Paus. 4, 3, 6-8; cf. also Bengl 16 n. 2); Webster 141 stated: "the whole city is upset by the strife between Polyphontes and those like Merope who are loyal to the memory of the old Kresphontes"; Vysoký 11 (summary 20) places this fragment in his *Kresphontes I* and speaks about a feud between Polyphontes and Kresphontes Sr. Basedow and Wecklein believed that the ode referred to quarrels within the royal palace: Basedow 22 argued that the chorus was female (women sympathizing with Merope; see intr. 2.2) and that women cannot be bothered about politics, so that it must be a private quarrel; Wecklein 10 also rejected political elements in the action of the *Kresphontes*: "Die politische Beziehung, die man früher für die Handlung annahm, hat das Lied nur für die athenischen Zuschauer gehabt".

I think the contents of the ode point rather to civil war than to a merely domestic quarrel: in itself εἰρήνη may refer to peace as opposed to private troubles (cf. *Med.* 1004, *Or.* 1683), but then the adj. βαθύπλουτε does not seem very appropriate; 7-8 suggest public celebrations, which would seem rather overdone if the troubles were not affecting the community; in 10 the troubles are referred to as Cτάcιc, which is the common word for civil strife (see comm.), and unfit for both domestic quarrels and a war with enemies from outside (which would be πόλεμοc); in 10-11 ἀπ' οἴ/κων is ambiguous: it may refer to 'our homes' or to 'the royal palace' (see comm.), and would therefore fit both interpretations. Considering all this I think it is most likely that the chorus is invoking Peace to come and relieve the town from civil war. How this fits into the action of the *Kresphontes*, however, is more difficult to see. Surely cτάcιc is a suitable word for referring to troubles with tyrants (cf. comm. on 10), but one would expect these troubles to have taken place at the time when Polyphontes actually killed Kresphontes Sr.

Still, it may be as Webster 141 suggested, that many years later the town was *still* divided in two parties (cf. also Lessing 412). Another possibility is that civil strife broke out only after Kresphontes had killed Polyphontes: cf. *El.* 844ff., where Aigisthos' servants are reported to have threatened Orestes and Pylades after they had killed the tyrant, and *HF* 568ff., where Herakles plans to kill also those Thebans who have sided with Lykos (cf. also 588ff. on these friends of Lykos). Something similar *may* have happened in the *Kresphontes*, but I do not think it very likely as (1) all testimonia suggest that all was well as soon as Polyphontes was killed, (2) what is expressed in this ode is a longing for Peace, *who is slow to come* (cf. 3) and such a desire strongly suggests a strife which had already lasted for some time, not just something which sprang up during the course of the play.

If the ode refers to a civil war already in progress it may perhaps be connected with the choral lament in the parodos (so Webster 141).

Metre: aeolic

1/10	– – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – |	glyc.
2/11	– – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – |	glyc. |
3/12	– – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – |	hipp. |
4	⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – |	$_{\wedge}$glyc. |
5	⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – |	ia.ba. |
6	– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – |	$_{\wedge}$hipp.^{d} |
7	– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – |	$_{\wedge}$hipp. |
8	⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – |	$_{\wedge}$hipp. |
9	⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ – |||	$_{\wedge}$wil. (or $_{\wedge}$2 chor.) |||

The strophic structure of the fragment was first seen by Bergk apud Meineke *FCGr* II 2, 988. The metre is on the whole straight-forward aeolic, but a few lines require some restoration *metri causa.*

3 The hipp., which sometimes stands as a clausula may mark the end of the invocation here; for hipp. as a clausula cf. e.g. *Alc.* 994, *Med.* 832, *IA* 800 and *Hipp.* 69, where it occurs, as here, within a strophe and may be marking the end of the main part of the hymn; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 58-71 (p. 168); more examples in Wilamowitz[3] 249.

4 Hartung's correction seems the most satisfactory.

6 The word-order of the mss. is hard to defend (though it is defended by Ellis 258, but without substantial arguments); I can only explain it as an 'acephalous asclepiadeus with drag', which, as far as I can see, is unparalleled. Kayser's transposition is one possibility: $_{\wedge}$glyc. + chor.; Austin's transposition (which I have printed) is another: it yields $_{\wedge}$hipp.^{d}, which is also found in A. *Pr.* 135 (end of strophe), *Suppl.* 526 (end of invocation) (cf. Dale 23 f.; 162) and may form the end of an Alcaic strophe (cf. E.-M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam 1971, 20; Snell[2] 46). (E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 1, Roma 1964, 397 regards A. *Pr.* 135 and *Suppl.* 526 as teles. + ba. and, according to a marginal note in his copy of Austin [which is now in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford; signature N.i. 162[1a]] had the same view of this line. But there is one short syllable too many. Cf. *Alc.* 437, 442 and the other examples of teles. + ba. which Fraenkel quotes on A. *Ag.* 1495 f.). Page's emendation seems unnecessary.

9 Meineke's correction yields ⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ –, which can be interpreted as (1) $_{\wedge}$wil. (the scheme of a tragic wil. is o o o o – ⏑ ⏑ –; cf. Snell[2] 37) or (2) $_{\wedge}$2 chor. or perhaps (3) 2 ion.$_{\wedge}$ (so Wilamowitz[3] 583 and Musso[6] ad loc. [following a suggestion of L. E. Rossi]; a combination of ionic and aeolic lines has also been claimed for e.g. *Ba.* 105 ff. [cf. Dodds on *Ba.* 64-169 Metre]; for another example cf. Dale 145 f.). The line may be compared with e.g. *Ba.* 370 ὁcία πότνα θεῶν, *HF* 680, S. *Ph.* 702.

If one keeps πότνια, analysis is more difficult. Austin, who does so, offers no suggestions as to the metre of the line. J. Diggle, Papyrologica Florentina

7, 1980, 59 suggests: "Perhaps ⟨ἴθ'⟩ἴθι, giving a lekythion [⏖ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏖ ⏑ –]" (not a pherecratean; cf. ibid. n. 4), comparing for the expression S. *Ph.* 832 ἴθι ἴθι μοι παιών, A. *Th.* 109 θεοὶ πολιάοχοι χθονὸc ἴτ' ἴτε πάντεc (cf. also S. *Ant.* 1328 ff., E. *Ph.* 681 βᾶθι βᾶθι τάνδε γᾶν, *Or.* 176). This interpretation presupposes that the first syllable of πότνια is short, which, although not common, may be paralleled with e.g. *Med.* 160, *Ion* 873. Still, I have some doubts about the lekythion: although a lekythion in an aeolic context can be paralleled with *Hipp.* 67 ἃ μέγαν κατ' οὐρανὸν and *El.* 153 πατέρα φίλτατον καλεῖ (where they may also be regarded as glyconics with single short instead of double short; cf. Wilamowitz[3] 247 f.; Barrett on *Hipp.* 58-71 Metre), neither of these passages shows resolution of the penultimate longum.

1-2 An invocation like this is a characteristic element in prayers; cf. Adami 222 ff.; Ausfeld 517 ff.; Langholf 51 ff.; Bremer o.c. 194 f.

Εἰρήνα: in Euripides we find Eirene personified in e.g. *Or.* 1682 f. τὴν καλλίcτην / θεῶν Εἰρήνην τιμῶντεc, *Ba.* 419 f. ὀλβοδότειραν Εἰ/ρήναν, κουροτρόφον θεάν. Evidence of her personification in earlier literature we find from Hes. *Th.* 902, *Op.* 228 onwards; certain evidence of a cult not earlier than IV B.C.; cf. M. P. Nilsson, Eranos 50, 1952, 37 n. 2; id.[1] 1, 814; Hamdorf 53 f.; 110. On the many prayers to personified abstracta in Euripides see further Langholf 49 ff. On the spelling Εἰρήνα see G. Björck, *Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache*, Uppsala 1950, 364.

βαθύπλουτε: 'abundant in riches'. Before Euripides we find this adj. in B. 3, 82 ζωὰν βαθύπλουτον τελεῖc, A. *Supp.* 554 βαθύπλουτον χθόνα (where Friis Johansen-Whittle let βαθυ- refer to "the deep, and so rich, soil of the land described"—a notion which, I think, is not favoured by the other occurrences of βαθύπλουτοc), fr. 16, 3 Mette τοῦ βαθυπλούτο[υ; later it occurs often in Nonn. *D.* (cf. Peek's lexicon); further references in LSJ s.v. For βάθοc, βαθύc in connection with wealth cf. S. *Aj.* 129 f. εἴ τινοc πλέον / ἢ χειρὶ βρίθειc ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει (with Jebb ad loc.), Ael. *VH* 3, 18 ἐν εἰρήνηι τε διάγειν καὶ πλούτωι βαθεῖ (more examples of βαθύc 'copious, abundant' in LSJ s.v. 3 b).

The idea that peace (which is favourable to trade, agriculture etc.; cf. Di Benedetto 132) produces wealth we find often expressed in Greek literature; cf. *Su.* 491 χαίρει (sc. Eirene) δὲ πλούτωι (with Collard on *Su.* 489-491a), *Ba.* 419 f.; further Pi. *O.* 13, 7 Δίκα καὶ ὁμότροφοc Εἰ/ρήνα, τάμι' ἀνδράcι πλούτου, B. *Pae.* 4, 61 f. τίκτει δέ τε⌋ θνατ⌊οῖcιν εἰ/ρήνα μεγαλ⌋άνορα ⌊πλοῦτον, *PMG* fr. adesp. 1021 ὦ γλυκεῖ' Εἰράνα, / πλουτοδότειρα βροτοῖc, *Inscr. Cret.* III 2, 20 ἁ φίλολβοc Εἰρήνα, cf. *h.Orph.* 40, 3 f. Quandt πλουτοδότειρα θεά (sc. Demeter), cταχυοτρόφε, παντοδότειρα, / εἰρήνηι χαίρουcα, Ar. fr. 109 (1, 419 Kock), Philemon fr. 71, 9 ff. (2, 496 Kock) γάμουc, ἑορτάc, cυγγενεῖc, παῖδαc, φίλουc, / πλοῦτον, ὑγίειαν, cῖτον, οἶνον,

ἡδονὴν / αὕτη (sc. Eirene) δίδωσι, Men. fr. 556 Koerte εἰρήνη γεωργὸν κἀν πέτραις / τρέφει καλῶς, πόλεμος δὲ κἀν πεδίωι κακῶς, *IG* III 1, 170, 1 εἰρήνης βαθυκάρπου. One may compare also the well-known statue by Cephisodotus representing Eirene carrying the child Ploutos on her arm (± 370 B.C., cf. Paus. 1, 8, 2; 9, 16, 2; Roman copy now in Munich). For some examples of this topos in Latin literature cf. L. Alfonsi, Dioniso 42, 1968, 5-8.

Langholf 54 f. notices that the way in which Eirene is invoked here (name + adj.) is used by Euripides mostly for the 'lower' gods (e.g. *Heracl.* 748 f. [Selene], *Hipp.* 1148 [Charites] etc.) or "Abstraktionsgottheiten" (e.g. *Med.* 160 [Themis], *Heracl.* 433 f. [Elpis] etc.), but only rarely for the more important gods.

καλλίστα μακάρων θεῶν: cf. *Or.* 1682 f. (quoted above), and for μακάρων θεῶν *Med.* 825 θεῶν παῖδες μακάρων, *HF* 758 †οὐρανίων μακάρων†, A. *Supp.* 1019 μάκαρας θεούς. The expression, which is not elsewhere attested in tragedy, but common in epic (cf. e.g. *Il.* 1, 339, *Od.* 1, 82 etc.), obviously has an epic flavour; cf. also Bergson 80; Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Supp.* 1019.

3 ζῆλος: usually an emulous desire rather than a simple longing for something (cf. LSJ s.v.). Here the connotation of jealousy is justified by the addition ὡς χρονίζεις 'because you linger so long', i.e. somewhere else, whereas I want you to come to *me.*

ὡς χρονίζεις: translated by Basedow 21 with "cum moreris", which was rejected by Wecklein 9 n. 1, who preferred "sehnsüchtig blicke ich nach Dir, wie lange Du säumst". This second interpretation is certainly more attractive.

4-8 In 4 the middle part of the prayer begins, where the chorus speaks about its fear that it may be old before Peace comes. These lines express some doubt as to the speedy arrival of Peace; cf. on this element of doubt in the central part of a prayer Ausfeld 534 f. Lines 6-8, which dwell upon the lovely time the chorus will have when Peace eventually will come, are distinctly utopian in tone, and at the same time continue the eulogy of Peace.

4 μὴ πόνοις: for metrical reasons it seems best to accept Hartung's emendation, although in itself there would be nothing against an adverbial πρίν in anticipation of πρίν in 6, especially after the negation; cf. e.g. *Il.* 2, 354 f., *HF* 604 f. πόλιν δὲ σὴν / μὴ πρὶν ταράξῃς πρὶν τόδ' εὖ θέσθαι (where see Wilamowitz and Bond on repeated πρίν as an epicism); LSJ s.v. πρίν B.

4-5 δέδοικα δὲ μὴ πόνοις / ὑπερβάλῃι με γῆρας: 'for I am afraid that old age shall overcome me with its suffering...'. With this passage we may compare Th. 1, 81, 6 δέδοικα δὲ μᾶλλον μὴ καὶ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτὸν (sc. the war) ὑπολίπωμεν, spoken by Archidamos in the debate at Sparta preceding the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war; cf. J. Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte 1 Anm.*, Heidelberg 1926, 179 n. 131; Goossens 285; Austin 47. As to the construction of the line it seems best to connect πόνοις with

ὑπερβάλῃι and let it refer to the miseries of old age. The phrasing seems largely conventional, because what the chorus is concerned about is mainly the unpleasant fact that Peace is delaying her coming so much that they may be old by the time she arrives (explaining ὡc χρονίζειc in 3). The addition that old age is accompanied by πόνοι does not seem to add much to the argument (though, perhaps, it suggests that they shall then be unable to enjoy the peace very much). For old age being notoriously unpleasant cf. e.g. fr. 282, 11 γῆρας πικρόν, 575, 3 μακρὸc γὰρ αἰὼν μυρίουc τίκτει πόνουc, 805 ὦ γῆρας, οἷον τοῖc ἔχουcιν εἶ κακόν, *Alc.* 669 f., *HF* 230 f., 637 ff. and more examples in Collard on *Su.* 1108 and Stob. 4, 50[b] (ΨΟΓΟϹ ΓΗΡΩϹ) passim.

ὑπερβάλῃι: for this construction of ὑπερβάλλω cf. S. *Tr.* 584 φίλτροιc δ'ἐάν πωc τήνδ' ὑπερβαλώμεθα (where Jebb remarks that the "dat. usu. denotes the point of excellence [Ar. *Eq.* 409 οὔ τοί μ'ὑπερβαλεῖcθ' ἀναιδείαι] and not, as here, the means"), E. *Or.* 691 f. μάχηι μὲν οὖν ἂν οὐχ ὑπερβαλοίμεθα / Πελαcγὸν Ἄργοc (different dat.); LSJ s.v. ὑπερβάλλω A II 1 and B I 1. In our passage the act. is more appropriate than the med. which we find in the parallels, as no personal 'interest' of γῆρας is involved.

γῆρας: surely the reproach contained in these lines gains more force when the chorus is younger. A chorus which was old already certainly could not speak these lines. For these reasons a young chorus was favoured by Basedow 22. A different opinion was held by Welcker 2, 831, who, in relation to this fragment speaks about "der Chor aus Messenischen Alten". Di Benedetto 149 f. compares fr. 369 = 60 A from *Erectheus* and regards the reference to old age in both fragments as a reflection of the poet's personal situation — Euripides being about sixty when he wrote these plays.

6 πρὶν cὰν: this correction is simple and attractive, whereas none of the mss.' readings gives a satisfactory text (πρὶν γὰρ makes no sense; πρίν περ makes the wrong sense, cf. KG 2, 170, 5; πρὶν ἂν perhaps arose because the scribe expected a conj. to follow, cf. KG 2, 454 f.; 458; ἢ πρὶν ἂν looks like a combination of the foregoing and πρὶν ἤ, which is Ionic, cf. KG 2, 445 n. 2; 460). Austin's transposition of the word-order in this line is metrically attractive (see comm. on metre 6). It shifts the hyperbaton from the type which we find in e.g. *Hipp.* 773 f. τὰν δ' εὔδοξον ἀνθ/αιρουμένα φήμαν to the type of e.g. *Andr.* 856 f. τᾶιδ' οὐκέτ' ἐνοικήcω / νυμφιδίωι cτέγαι. A drawback of Kayser's transposition, which is metrically equally possible, is that it normalizes the hyperbaton. On hyperbaton in Euripidean lyrics cf. in general Breitenbach 242 ff.

7 καλλιχόρουc ἀοιδὰc: 'songs with lovely dancing'. The adj. we find already in epic, where it is applied to towns 'with fair dancing grounds' (LSJ), cf. *Od.* 11, 581 διὰ καλλιχόρου Πανοπῆοc, *hHom.* 15, 2 Θήβηιc ἔνι καλλιχόροιcιν. Sometimes Euripides uses it in this traditional sense (e.g. *Heracl.* 359 f. καλλιχόροιc Ἀθή/ναιc; cf. Bergson 107), but on other occasions he

gives it a different meaning, so *HF* 687 ff. παιᾶνα μὲν Δηλιάδες / ... ὑμνοῦς' ... / τὸν Λατοῦς ... γόνον, / εἱλίσσουσαι καλλίχορον (*L*: -οι Hermann, accepted by Diggle) (which comes close to our καλλιχόρους ἀοιδάς). Cf. also *Ph.* 786 ἐπὶ καλλιχόροις στεφάνοισι (which, in an address to Ares recalls our fragment), *Hel.* 1454 f. χοραγὲ τῶν καλλιχόρων / δελφίνων ('dancing beautifully'); Breitenbach 61 f.

For peace associated with song and dance cf. further e.g. B. *Pae.* 4, 61 ff. τίκτει δέ τε⌋ θνατ⌊οῖσιν εἰ/ρήνα μεγαλ⌋άνορα ⌊πλοῦτον / καὶ μελιγλώ⌋σσων ἀ⌊οιδᾶν ἄνθεα, Ar. *Pax* 976 δέσποινα χορῶν.

8 φιλοστεφάνους: in tragedy only here; elsewhere the adj. is used of goddesses: *hCer.* 102 φιλοστεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης (cf. Richardson ad loc.), B. 13, 183 f. σὺν Εὐ/κλείαι δὲ φιλοστεφ[άνωι; and of men: Ion fr. 26, 13 f. West Διόνυσε, φιλοστεφάνοισιν ἀρέσκων / ἀνδράσιν. For wreaths at peace-celebrations cf. e.g. *Ph.* 786 (quoted above on 7), fr. 369, 3 = 60, 3 A ἄιδοιμι κάρα στεφάνοις πολιὸν στεφανώσας (also in a wish for peace).

κώμους: cf. B. *Pae.* 4, 67 f. γυμνασίω⌋ν τε νέοι⌊ς / αὐλῶν τε καὶ⌋ κώμω⌊ν μέλειν as one of the results of peace.

9 With this line we reach the actual petition, appropriately placed at the end of the strophe, and then continued into the first lines of the antistrophe. How it went on after 12 we have no means of knowing, but it seems a likely guess that the quotation was finished at a 'sensible' point, i.c. at the end of the prayer to Peace (again the hipp. in 12 may have a clausular function; cf. comm. on metre 3).

9 ff. show some of the elements which are regarded as typical of the actual petition: (1) the formulation of the request with the imperat. ἴθι and εἶργ'; cf. Adami 234 ff., Ausfeld 537 ff., Langholf 59 ff., (2) the goddess is invoked again with πότνα; cf. e.g. Sappho fr. 1, 4; E. *Heracl.* 770; more examples of this renewed invocation in Ausfeld 537.

ἴθι: a request to come is very common in prayers, cf. e.g. *Andr.* 509 μόλε, *El.* 680 ἐλθέ, *Or.* 176 ἴθι, μόλε μόλε; more examples in Langholf 59 f.; cf. also Bremer o.c. 194. The imperat. praes. which we have here is much less common in prayers than the imperat. aor.; cf. W. F. Bakker, *The Greek imperative*, Amsterdam 1966, 98-127 (according to Bakker there are three cases in which the imperat. praes. occurs in prayers: [1] in situations of actual distress, where the emotion is so vehement that the prayer almost becomes a compelling order [104 ff.], [2] in wishes which one expects the god to fulfil because it suits his particular function [111 ff.], [3] in general wishes, not connected with a particular situation, often in a hymn or traditional prayer and asking for a long-lasting benefit [116 ff.]; because of the lack of context, however, it is hard to see which explanation would fit our fragment); Langholf 64 f.

The construction of ἴθι with acc. is not at all exceptional (cf. e.g. *HF* 792 f.

ἤξετ' ... / ἐμὰν πόλιν [*L*: αὔξετ' Fix, accepted by Diggle], *Ion* 458, *Ph.* 681), so that there is no reason to change πόλιν into πάλιν with Bergk or into ταχύ with Schmidt.

πότνα: this is but a slight emendation and metrically more satisfactory than πότνια (cf. also Di Benedetto 132 n. 5). As to the form, we find both πότνα and πότνια used as a vocative in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Ba.* 370 ὁcία πότνα θεῶν (metrically equivalent to our line), *Alc.* 976f. μή μοι, πότνια, μείζων / ἔλθοιc. Epic evidence does not support the view that πότνα was originally the voc. and πότνια the nom. as W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen 1966², 325ff. (= KZ 33, 1895, 316ff.) tried to prove (wherein he was followed by Dodds on *Ba.* 370); cf. e.g. *Il.* 6, 264 πότνια μῆτερ and Richardson on *hCer.* 118.

For goddesses referred to with single πότνια cf. e.g. *Alc.* 976 (Ananke), *IT* 463, 1082, 1123 (Artemis). In all these cases the identity of the πότνια is clear from the context, as it is here; cf. Langholf 53.

πότνα, πόλιν: alliteration.

10 τὰν δ'ἐχθρὰν Cτάcιν: Bergk's τὰν δ' is certainly preferable to the mss.' τάνδ'; cf. τὰν μαινομέναν τ'ἔριν in the next line. The article here has a certain demonstrative force: 'that Cτάcιc from which we all suffer'; cf. KG 1, 576. cτάcιc meaning 'faction, sedition, discord' (LSJ s.v. B III 2) we find in Euripides almost always in connection with tyrannis: *Andr.* 471ff. οὐδέ γ'ἐνὶ πόλεcι δίπτυχοι τυραννίδεc / μιᾶc ἀμείνονεc φέρειν / ἄχθοc ἐπ'ἄχθει καὶ cτάcιc πολίταιc, i.e. two tyrants in one city lead to cτάcιc; *HF* 33f. κτείνει Κρέοντα καὶ κτανὼν ἄρχει χθονόc, / cτάcει νοcοῦcαν τήνδ' ἐπεcπεcὼν πόλιν, sc. Lykos using the cτάcιc as an opportunity to come to power, cf. 272ff., 542f., 590; only in fr. 282, 27 it is used in a more general way. We may also compare Dio Chrys. 1, 82 where Stasis is mentioned as one of the attendants of Tyrannis. For the expression ἐχθρὰν cτάcιν cf. Pi. fr. 109, 3f. cτάcιν ἀπὸ πραπίδοc ἐπίκοτον ἀνελών, / πενίαc δότειραν, ἐχθρὰν κουροτρόφον and perhaps *Pae.* 14, 13 ọὔṭ' ẹ̓χθρὰ cτάcιc?] (cf. also *Pae.* 9, 15), Ar. *Ra.* 359 cτάcιν ἐχθρὰν μὴ καταλύει; on the undesirability of cτάcιc cf. also A. *Eu.* 976ff. (If one wants to regard our fragment as a warning against contemporal cτάcιc it is worth comparing Th. 3, 82f.). For the personification of Stasis see on 10-11.

10-11 ἀπ' οἴ/κων: in itself this can mean either 'our homes' or 'the royal palace', but if we consider the context the first meaning seems to be preferable here: the contents of the ode suggest civil war rather than a mere domestic quarrel (see intr. above), and it is a logical inference that in that case the cτάcιc affected the homes of all the citizens, not just the royal palace. For this meaning of the plural (which is less common than the meaning 'royal palace' in tragedy) cf. e.g. *Tr.* 892f. ἐξαιρεῖ πόλειc, / πίμπρηcιν οἴκουc, *Ph.* 533.

τὰν μαινομέναν ... Ἔριν: for this expression cf. A. *Th.* 935 ἔριδι μαινο-

μέναι. As the context strongly suggests that ἔριϲ is here personified (see below), it seems best to take Ἔριν here as "a mysterious force that periodically disrupts not only the lives of individuals but the prosperity of the whole city" (J. R. Wilson, *Eris in Euripides*, G & R 26, 1979, 14); cf. *Ph.* 798f. ἦ δεινά τιϲ Ἔριϲ θεόϲ, ἃ τάδε / μήϲατο πήματα γᾶϲ βαϲιλεῦϲιν, referring to the quarrel between Eteokles and Polyneikes, which has led to the siege of the city; Hes. *Th.* 226ff., where Eris is the mother of Μάχαι, Φόνοι, Ἀνδροκταϲίαι etc.

Considering the part. τερπομέναν in the next line I think we are justified in writing Ἔριν. Cf. for the personification of ἔριϲ in Euripides e.g. *Ph.* 798f., *Or.* 1001 and in general v. Sybel in Roscher I 1, 1337f. (s.v. Eris); Hamdorf 66; on the importance of Eris in Euripides Wilson o.c. 7-20. If ἔριϲ is personified here, it is likely that ϲτάϲιϲ too was personified; cf. Höfer in Roscher IV 1422 (s.v. Stasis), who quotes as his first sources [D.] 25, 52 and Dio Chrys. 1, 82 Ὠμότηϲ καὶ Ὕβριϲ καὶ Ἀνομία καὶ Ϲτάϲιϲ, as attendants of Tyrannis. Still, it would be not at all unusual if Euripides had already introduced Stasis as a personification in his *Kresphontes* (on this habit of Euripides, especially—but not exclusively—in his later plays, cf. Langholf 49f.) and also in A. *Eu.* 977 ϲτάϲιϲ may be personified: cf. Page's text. For close association of ἔριϲ and ϲτάϲιϲ cf. also S. *OC* 1234f. φθόνοϲ, ϲτάϲειϲ, ἔριϲ, μάχαι / καὶ φόνοι.

12 θηκτῶι: the adj. is not attested in poetry before tragedy (but nevertheless regarded as "traditionnel" by Bergson 129); it is found once in Aeschylus: A. *Th.* 944 θηκτὸϲ ϲίδαροϲ and several times in Euripides: *Med.* 379 θηκτὸν ... φάϲγανον (= *Med.* 40, which is usually rejected as an interpolation; cf. Page on 37-44), *Ion* 1064 θηκτὸν ξίφοϲ, *Ph.* 68 θηκτῶι ϲιδήρωι and perhaps fr. 66, 55 A; cf. also *Rh.* 669 θηκτὰ ... ξίφη.

fr. 454 = 72 A

As to the location of this fragment opinions differ. One group of scholars placed it in the mock-reconciliation (so Basedow 30f., Webster 142, Vysoký 8, Musso[6] ad loc.). But there is an objection to this in the context of Plutarch, as was noticed by Wecklein 11 n. 1: "... die Worte können den Eindruck nicht auf die Zuschauer machen, wenn sie auf Verstellung beruhen und nur zur Täuschung dienen". He believed that the lines were spoken by Merope when she had heard about the story of the stranger (i.e. that he was the man who had killed her son) and that the *senex* appeared with his reports only after these words of Merope (cf. also Welcker 2, 834 and Hartung 2, 51, who let Merope speak these words when she had heard the *senex* 'confirming' the story of the stranger). A difficulty with this interpretation, however, is that it is not easy to see how the resignation with which Merope speaks fr. 454 can

be reconciled with the violent attack with the axe, which closely followed the reports of the *senex* (on the possible sequence of events see comm. on test. 5, 13-14).

Now a fresh look at the context may lead to a third, and more attractive solution: 'Plutarch' really gives us two hints: (1) λόγουϲ ἀνδρώδειϲ προφερομένη, a description which does not at all fit the mock-reconciliation: the words spoken in fr. 454 can be called brave only as long as the speaker believes in them, (2) κινεῖ τὰ θέατρα, which at first sight suggests that the audience was moved (on this sense cf. Griffin 118), but may also indicate that they were thrilled because they knew better (cf. Σ S. *OT* 264 = *TrGF* 4, T 130 referring to Oidipus' 'ironic' words in 264 f. αἱ τοιαῦται ἔννοιαι οὐκ ἔχονται μὲν τοῦ ϲεμνοῦ, κινητικαὶ δέ εἰϲι τοῦ θεάτρου· αἷϲ καὶ πλεονάζει Εὐριπίδηϲ, ὁ δὲ Cοφοκλῆϲ πρὸϲ βραχὺ μὲν αὐτῶν ἅπτεται πρὸϲ τὸ κινῆϲαι τὸ θέατρον). A combination of these two indications points, I think, to a scene in which Merope still tries to console herself for the loss of husband and sons (with παῖδεϲ she may refer to her two elder sons only or to all three, as it is quite conceivable that she was pessimistic about the survival and safe return of Kresphontes even before the messages of the stranger and *senex* reached her), but is not yet given an opportunity for revenge, whereas the audience already knows that Kresphontes is on the premises, alive and eager to take revenge. In such a scene, I think, Merope's brave words would create a theatrical effect worthy of and in accordance with 'Plutarch's' comment.

1 οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνηι βροτῶν ... ἀλλὰ μυρίαι: it is a common consolatory motif that one is not alone in suffering; cf. e.g. *Med.* 1017 οὔτοι μόνη ϲὺ ϲῶν ἀπεζύγηϲ τέκνων, *Hipp.* 834 f. οὐ ϲοὶ τάδ', ὦναξ, ἦλθε δὴ μόνωι κακά, / πολλῶν μετ'ἄλλων δ'ὤλεϲαϲ κεδνὸν λέχοϲ, *Alc.* 417 f., 892, 931 ff., *Andr.* 1041 f., *Hel.* 464, fr. 418, 2; S. *El.* 153 f., 289 f.; Kassel 6; 70 ff.; Kannicht on *Hel.* 464; Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Supp.* 1050-1.

2 ἐϲτερήμεθ': Bothe wished to emend ἐϲτέρην μι', but μία cannot be used in the sense of μόνη. On the other hand μόναι can easily be understood from the preceding line and the plural instead of singular is not at all exceptional in a tragic poet. Cf. H. Zilliacus, *Selbstgefühl und Servilität. Studien zum unregelmässigen Numerusgebrauch im Griechischen*, Helsingfors 1953, 21 ff. (who observes that the plural is often used instead of sg. in order to convey a notion of modesty or identification with a larger group of people, and is especially frequent with women and heroes in distress); A. G. Katsouris, *Plural in place of singular*, RhM 120, 1977, 228-40; KG 1, 83 f. Here the use of the plural may, at first sight, seem difficult because it follows the singular ἐμοὶ μόνηι, but there are many examples of this transition from singular to plural or *vice versa* in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Med.* 346 τοὐμοῦ γὰρ οὔ μοι φροντίϲ, εἰ φευξούμεθα, 765, *Hipp.* 244 αἰδούμεθα γὰρ τὰ λελεγμένα μοι, *Andr.* 141 ff. οἰκτροτάτα γὰρ ἔμοιγ' ἔμολεϲ ... οἴκουϲ / δεϲποτῶν ἐμῶν· φόβωι δ' / ἡϲυχίαν ἄγομεν, 435 etc.; more examples in KG 1, 84; Katsouris o.c. 238 f.

3 ἐξήντληcαν ... βίον: ἀντλέω and composita (ἐξ-, ὑπεξ-, δι-), which literally mean 'to drain off, draw off' we find in Euripides usually in a metaphorical sense: 'to endure to the end'. Cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 898 λυπρὸν ἀντλήcει βίον, *Alc.* 353 f. βάρος / ψυχῆc ἀπαντλοίην ἄν, *Cyc.* 10, 110, 282, *Med.* 79, *Su.* 838, fr. 1007 d 2 Snell. In *Ion* 927 κακῶν γὰρ ἄρτι κῦμ' ὑπεξαντλῶν φρενί we can still sense something of the maritime origine of the metaphor. The connection between the toilsome job of drawing off bilge-water and the enduring of hardships is easy to understand. Cf. on this metaphor Van Nes 143 ff.; Dale on *Alc.* 354; Collard on *Su.* 838-40.

fr. 455 = 73 A

As to the location of this fragment, it is generally believed that it goes closely with fr. 454. Merope may well illustrate the fact that she is not alone in losing her children by referring to Niobe who lost fourteen children. Still, it cannot be excluded that these lines were spoken by another person, who for instance tried to comfort Merope with a mythological example. On such mythological paradeigmata in tragedy (which are on the whole more common and elaborate in lyrics than in spoken verse) cf. H. Friis Johansen, *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis. A Study of Form*, Copenhagen 1959, 50 ff., who remarks that our fragment "should probably be added to the group of παραδείγματα with formal resemblance to *comparationes paratacticae*" (52 n. 14). R. Oehler, *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*, Diss. Basel 1925, 78-111 gives a survey of mythological exempla in tragedy (on p. 102 f. he deals with our fragment).

1 δὶc ἑπτ': the number of Niobids has shown some fluctuation in antiquity (cf. e.g. the sources quoted in the apparatus). For a survey of the various numbers and their sources cf. W. H. Roscher, *Die Sieben- und Neunzahl im Kultus und Mythus der Griechen*, Leipzig 1904, 44-47 (who remarks that the numbers, though varied, all have in common that they are 'typical' numbers); Barrett apud Carden 227. The number of seven girls and seven boys we also find recorded for Aeschylus, Sophocles and Aristophanes and it has become canonical in later art and literature (on this number cf. also Roscher l.c.; other groups of seven children are listed by Roscher o.c. 48 f.). In Euripides the tomb of the seven girls is mentioned in *Ph.* 159 f.; in the only other passage which we have where he speaks about Niobe (*Antiope* 94 ff. [Page *GLP* 1, 70]) there is no mention of the children.

αὐτῆc ... / Νιόβηc: one of these words seems superfluous. We may therefore doubt the soundness of either αὐτῆc (with Nauck and others) or of Νιόβηc (with Bothe and others). I think that Νιόβηc is more likely to be a corruption than αὐτῆc: it may well be an intrusive gloss (as was suggested by Blaydes 136; cf. now also West 75). The intrusion of proper names into

classical texts is a common form of corruption (cf. e.g. Barrett on *Hipp.* 72, 1403; R. Merkelbach, ZPE 1, 1967, 100ff.; S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, Köln 1967, 174 + n. 162; for an intrusive gloss in a fragment cf. fr. 472 [= 79 A] and R. Merkelbach, RhM 97, 1954, 373f.; Austin 51; some intrusive glosses in Stobaeus — though not of names — are listed by Luria 82). It may occur in a very early stage (examples from papyri are given by Merkelbach in the articles mentioned above), so that it may well be that a person who first excerpted a text for a certain purpose found the corruption already there and took it over without noticing.

In the Euripides-scholia there is a somewhat comparable case in Σ *Ph.* 1062, where the scholiast quotes Παλλάδοϲ φραδαῖϲιν from *Ph.* 667. In 667, however, Παλλάδοϲ has been deleted in Murray's text as a gloss (but much is uncertain in this passage, so the parallel should not be pressed). It is less likely that Νιόβηϲ was inserted by a scholiast for the sake of clarity, because it is abundantly clear from the context in Σ *Ph.* 159 that what we are concerned with are Niobe's children, so we would have to assume that the scholiast really wished to make himself very clear if he was the one who added Νιόβηϲ. Even so, this idea might be supported by Σ *Tr.* 1030, where *Andr.* 628 is quoted as οὐκ ἔκτανεϲ γυναῖκα *ϲὴν* χειρίαν λαβών: ϲὴν may be an insertion of the scholiast.

A reason why 'Niobe' was written in the margin of a *text* of the *Kresphontes* could be that in the immediate neighbourhood of our fragment she was referred to not by her name, but by some description like 'the daughter of Tantalos'. Cf. e.g. *Antiope* 96 (Page *GLP* 1, 70) τὴν Ταντάλου παῖδ', S. *Ant.* 824f. τὰν Φρυγίαν ξέναν / Ταντάλου. In view of this Barrett's τὴν Ταντα-λείαν is attractive. This presupposes a further change of the original gloss Νιόβην into a genitive when the name got into the text. If the original gloss was Νιόβηϲ it must have been a gloss on a genitive, so e.g. τῆϲ Τανταλείαϲ (I wonder: what about καὶ — τέκνα / ὁμοῦ [or κακῶϲ or οἰκτρῶϲ?] θανόν-τα — τοξεύμαϲιν / τῆϲ Τανταλείαϲ? Cf. on this sequence KG 1, 658f. and comm. on *Arch.* fr. 232; for a possible objection see below).

As to the beginning of 2: if Νιόβηϲ is rejected, this may be filled in with an adverb going with θανόντα, so ὁμοῦ or κακῶϲ or οἰκτρῶϲ are among the possibilities; another possibility is a verb like Blaydes' εἶδον or an adj. (cf. e.g. fr. 562, 1).

A somewhat different explanation for corruption into Νιόβηϲ is offered by Wecklein 12 n. 1: it crept in from the preceding line. It is also possible that the scholiast was led astray by Νιόβηϲ occurring at the beginning of *Ph.* 160. If αὐτῆϲ is corrupt and Νιόβηϲ sound I can see no way of explaining the corruption.

2 Λοξίου: the killing of Niobe's children is always done by Apollo *and* Artemis, Apollo dealing with the boys and Artemis with the girls. So already

Il. 24, 602 ff. Cf. Barrett apud Carden 176 n. 12; 228 f. (to whose evidence one may add B. fr. 20 D 5 S-M τὰν ὤλεσαν Λατοῦς α̣ [ ]. Therefore Barrett may well be right when he remarks: "When Euripides in his *Kresphontes* (...) spoke of δὶς ἕπτ' αὐτῆς τέκνα / Νιόβης θανόντα Λοξίου τοξεύμασιν, I do not suppose that he thought of Apollo as sole executioner: if the sense is complete, perhaps (in an incidental allusion) inaccuracy for brevity's sake; more likely perhaps e.g. Λοξίου τοξεύμασιν / ⟨θεᾶς θ' ὁμαίμου⟩" (Barrett apud Carden 229 n. 138). If so, there can have been no description of Niobe in 'line 3', as I suggested above.

fr. 456 = 74 A

This fragment was attributed to the *Kresphontes* by Valckenaer 181. It is clear from the context in Plutarch that it must come from the famous scene in which Merope is about to attack her son with an axe and stopped only at the last moment by the old servant, who recognizes the victim as young Kresphontes. This type of anagnorisis, just before something irrevocable is done, is praised by Aristotle, who quotes the recognition-scene in the *Kresphontes* as an example (test. 8); cf. also test. 9.

The motif of relatives on the verge of killing each other and then recognizing each other instead seems to have been popular in Greek tragedy. Arist. *Po.* 1454 a 5 also mentions *IT* and then adds καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἕλλῃ ὁ υἱὸς τὴν μητέρα ἐκδιδόναι μέλλων ἀνεγνώρισεν — nothing, however, is known about this *Helle*. Apart from this there is the well-known story of Euripides' *Ion* and some indications of the motif in lost plays: perhaps in S. *Mysoi* (Auge almost killing her son; cf. Hyg. *fab.* 100 and on this fabula Radt *TrGF* 4 p. 349); E. *Aigeus* (Aigeus almost poisoning his son; cf. test. in Nauck p. 363; Matthiessen[1] 112) and *Alexandros* (Hekabe almost killing Paris; it is now clear from the summary in a papyrus published by Coles[2] that Hekabe was the principal attacker of Paris [cf. col. I 24-25 and Coles[2] 25 f.]; on the relation of this scene with the scene in the *Kresphontes* cf. Snell[1] 47 and 61). (F. Solmsen, Hermes 69, 1934, 412 f. suggests that perhaps in the *Antiope* Dirke gave Antiope to her own sons to carry out the killing with the bull [cf. Σ A.R. 4, 1090], but this is rejected by Kambitsis XIX for scenical reasons).

The context in Plutarch strongly suggests that this scene was performed on the stage, as it is hard to see how the scene could have the effect on the audience which is described by Plutarch, if it was retold in a messenger-speech (at the beginning of which the outcome of the event would of course have been told). The argument that fr. 456 preserves the actual words spoken by Merope at the moment of the attack, however, cannot be used, as such words could also be quoted in a messenger-speech (cf. J. Gould, JHS 93, 1973, 102). We may compare the attacks in *Ion* 1250 ff. and *Alexandros* (cf. Snell[1] 47;

Coles² 27, who, however, in n. 25 tentatively speaks about an indoor-scene with ekkyklema). Now all would be well, were it not that test. 5, 10ff. gives some information about this scene which seems to contradict the idea of an outdoor-scene: *interim rex eum* (sc. Cresphontem) *iussit in hospitio manere, ut amplius de eo perquireret. qui cum per lassitudinem obdormisset, senex ... ad Meropen uenit ...* (after which) *Merope ... in chalcidicum cum securi uenit inscia ut filium suum interficeret.*

Surely the statement that Kresphontes was asleep fits in nicely with what Plutarch tells us: when he was thus made unaware of any imminent danger, the scene must have become extremely exciting. Great confusion, however, has been caused by the words *in hospitio* and *in chalcidicum*. These were taken as indications of an indoor-scene, and as, with the testimony of Plutarch, it could hardly be denied that the scene was visible to the audience, many attempts have been made to get the indoor-scene 'outdoors' again, none of them very satisfactory though:

(1) an indoor-scene was played on the ekkyklema (Welcker 2, 834, Webster 141 f.; and, admitting that a scene thus acted on the ekkyklema would be rather unusual, Wecklein 12f., Hourmouziades 105f.). It is, however, very unlikely that the ekkyklema was used for the staging of a scene like ours: it was really meant for so-called *tableaux*, mostly showing the corpses after some murder had been committed (cf. Pollux 4, 128: it shows τὰ ... πραχθέντα; in Euripides, *HF* 1029ff. would be a typical case for an ekkyklema; for other cases cf. e.g. A. E. Haigh - A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Attic Theatre*, Oxford 1907 [ʳNew York 1969], 203ff.);

(2) the scene was played in a porch (Hartung 2, 51, Basedow 30, K. Rees, CPh 10, 1915, 127, Musso⁶ XXIf. [cf. Musso¹ 85]). This idea wins some support from the fact that *chalcidicum* may stand for 'a kind of portico or porch' (*OLD* s.v.; I could not find the word in *ThLL*; cf. e.g. Vitr. 5, 1, 4), but then (a) it is not certain that it always means that (cf. the lexica and the passages from Ausonius quoted below), (b) it is a matter of dispute whether the Dionysus-theatre ca. 424 B.C. had the architectural features which could represent such a porch, (c) even if there was such a porch at the time of the original performance of the *Kresphontes*, it would be unsuitable for playing any scenes, because it would be in the shade most of the day; cf. Melchinger o.c. 10, 114, 193 and the photographs in M. F. Gerhäuser, *Untersuchungen über die Spielmöglichkeiten in griechischen Theatern*, Darmstadt 1964, Anhang [p. 43ff.] and p. 29; Taplin 325 + n. 4;

(3) the scene was played on an upper story: this was suggested by Turner³ 125 as a possibility, for which he compared Aus. *Per. Od.* I, 11 (p. 392 Peiper) *Penelope degressa chalcidico*, where *chalcidico* seems to stand for Penelope's ὑπερῷιον (cf. also Aus. *Per. Od.* XXIII, 2 [p. 404 Peiper]) and A. *Ag.* 1 ff. and E. *Ph.* 88ff., wondering whether our scene too could have been played "on

the roof of the stage-building, the theologeion". However, in the *Agamemnon* (watchman) and the *Phoinissai* (teichoscopy) there are good reasons for playing the scene on the roof, whereas it is hard to think of a reason for bringing Kresphontes upstairs. Besides, the Homeric ὑπερῷιον is best regarded as a secluded upper room, not visible for outsiders as a roof would be;

(4) an indoor-scene played inside the palace (so Müller 187ff.: the scene is played inside, but the cries are heard by the chorus) or half inside, half outside (so Jahn 228f.: Merope rushes in with her axe; chorus is anxious; Kresphontes rushes out, followed by Merope; intervention of *senex*; this solution was accepted by C. Robert, Hermes 32, 1897, 428 n. 1). If we want to treat Plutarch and Hyginus as sources of equal importance I think that Jahn's attempt is the most satisfactory of the solutions offered so far: *chalcidicum* could then still mean 'porch', but it would have to be one *inside* the palace, and one may recall the habit in Homer to let guests sleep in the αἴθουcα or πρόδομος, also within the court (cf. M. O. Knox, CQ 23, 1973, 9). Thus Jahn's solution on one hand accounts for the use of the words *chalcidicum* and *hospitium* (an inside porch as guests' quarters) and on the other hand for the description of Plutarch (attack visible on the stage).

Still, it may be good to bear in mind the different nature of our two sources: Plutarch is referring to an actual performance of the *Kresphontes* and its effect in the theatre (on the possibility of him having seen the play himself cf. Lucas on Arist. *Po.* 1454 a 5), whereas Hyginus may be merely telling us 'the story' of the *Kresphontes*, without sticking to the details of the play as it was performed (cf. intr. to test. 5), and adding romantic details here and there; cf. E. Schwartz, *RE* 1, 1894, 2882 (s.v. Apollodoros [61]). That is, if Plutarch strongly suggests an outdoor-scene and Hyginus appears to contradict it, I am inclined to give more weight to the statement of Plutarch, and consider reconciliation with the evidence from Hyginus as a matter of secondary importance, though, of course, if the two can be reconciled in a satisfactory way, so much the better. Now Jahn comes very close to a satisfactory explanation, but a drawback may be that the audience does not, with his interpretation, actually *see* the confrontation between an innocently sleeping Kresphontes and Merope approaching him with her axe, sure to kill him as soon as she reaches him: the theatrical effect of such a scene would, I think, be much more thrilling—and therefore more in accordance with the words of Plutarch—than if she just pursued him when he came rushing out. To get this effect one must either accept one of the first three solutions, none of which is particularly attractive, or indeed suppose that Hyginus adds some details which do not reflect the situation in the play. But as soon as we throw out the *chalcidicum* and keep the sleeping (which is not mentioned by Plutarch) the whole business becomes extremely subjective and arbitrary

(besides, sleeping without the *chalcidicum* seems difficult: was Kresphontes so tired that he just curled up on the stage? what happened while he lay there asleep? surely the *senex*—who knew him—could not be at the same time delivering his message to Merope? For contrast cf. the way in which the sleeping of Philoktetes is integrated in the play in S. *Ph.* 821 ff.).

In short, it seems best to stick to the idea of an outdoor scene, but admit that the evidence does not permit a convincing reconciliation of the statements of Plutarch and Hyginus.

1 †ὠνητέραν†: ὠνητέραν was accepted by the editors of the Loeb-edition of Plutarch (H. Cherniss-W. C. Helmbold 1957 vol. 12 p. 575), who translate: "This blow I give you is more costly yet", and defended by Lens 257. But (1) such a comparative of the verbal adj. is very unlikely, (2) it does not make sense. Several conjectures have been proposed, two of which deserve some attention:

ὁcιωτέραν Turnebus: accepted by Valckenaer 181 and defended by Wecklein 12, who suggests that ὁcιωτέραν refers to a preceding ἀνοcίωc (e.g. ἀνοcίωι μόρωι τὸν φίλτατόν μοι παῖδ' ἀποκτείναc ἔχειc; cf. *Hipp.* 1287) and points to the tragic irony of the words, because Merope, killing her son, would be acting very ἀνοcίωc indeed. I wonder whether ὁcιωτέραν would not rather refer to a preceding ὁcίωc/ὅcιοc etc. (or a synonym) than to the negative ἀνοcίωc (cf. Jahn 228 f. "Aus dem Schlafe aufgeschreckt, stürzt er [sc. Kresphontes] auf die Bühne und ruft ihr zu nicht so das heilige Gastrecht zu verletzen", to which Merope answers with fr. 456), but this does not affect the attractiveness of the conjecture as such. One could compare *IT* 1194 ὁcιώτεροι γοῦν τῆι θεῶι πέcοιεν ἄν (sc. if the sword is cleansed in the sea). On ὅcιοc etc. in contexts which deal primarily with the behaviour of mortals towards each other cf. M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk, Mnem. III 10, 1942, 133 ff.; on ὅcιοc in contexts about the killing of relatives J. C. Bolkestein, *Ὅcιοc en Εὐcεβήc*, Amsterdam 1936, 38 f. (of parents causing the death of their children e.g. *Med.* 796, *Hipp.* 1287);

ὦ νέρτερ' Ἅιδη Porson: this has also found some support (cf. e.g. Musso[6] ad loc.), but I think it is very odd, because then coι would naturally refer to Hades (as in *Hel.* 969 ὦ νέρτερ' Ἅιδη, καὶ cὲ cύμμαχον καλῶ). Besides, one would prefer an adj. standing pred. with τήνδ', which seems a little pointless standing on its own.

δή: apparently emphatic; if the preceding word, hidden in †ὠνητέραν† was a comparative, one may compare Denniston 204 f.

πληγήν: Cobet wanted to delete this as a gloss and quoted many examples of πληγήν/πληγάc being left out (cf. also LSJ s.v. πληγή 1). However, in his examples either the verb means 'to beat' or it is clear from the context that we have to do with beating (so e.g. Ar. *Nu.* 972 τυπτόμενοc πολλάc and A. *Ag.* 1386 τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι [context!]). Here we know nothing about the context,

so no decision is possible (but, of course, if the meaning of τήνδ' originally was clear from the context, it was necessary to add πληγήν when the line was excerpted, because otherwise it would be incomprehensible).

Apparently this fragment was closely followed by the intervention of the *senex*. Plu. *De esu carnium* 2, 5, 998 e goes on εἰ δ'ἕτερος γέρων παρεστήκοι λέγων 'παῖcον, πολέμιός ἐcτιν', ἕτερος δὲ 'μὴ παίcηιc, υἱός ἐcτι', πότερον ἀδίκημα μεῖζον, ἐχθροῦ κόλαcιν ἐκλιπεῖν διὰ τὸν υἱὸν ἢ τεκνοκτονίαι περιπεcεῖν ὑπὸ τῆc πρὸc τὸν ἐχθρὸν ὀργῆc; which seems to be an allusion to this intervention. For other instances of intervention at the last moment cf. *Ion* 1320 ἐπίcχεc, ὦ παῖ, *Antiope* 64f. (Page *GLP* 1, 68) παῦcαι κελ]εύω [φόν]ιον ἐξορμ[ωμ]ένουc / ὁρμήν, ἄνα]ξ Ἀμφῖον, *Hyps*. fr. 60, 22 ἐπίcχεc, ὦ πέμπουcα τ[ή]νδ' ἐπὶ cφαγά[c (and Bond ad loc., who gives some more examples). It seems likely that after this Merope and Kresphontes expressed their joy at the reunion; cf. Matthiessen[1] 135 "In allen erhaltenen Erkennungsdramen seit der "Elektra" des Sophokles finden sich unmittelbar nach der Erkennung einige fast formelhafte Wendungen, in denen die Freude des Wiedersehens ihren Ausdruck findet", after which he gives a list of the elements one finds in these scenes (135ff.).

fr. 457 = 75 A

Most scholars have regarded this line as an apology of Merope after the anagnorisis, when she realizes that she has almost killed her son (cf. Welcker 2, 835, Hartung 2, 52 etc.). They were led to this opinion by (1) αἰδώc, (2) τέκνον. However, Basedow 33f. pointed out that τέκνον is not necessarily said by Merope to Kresphontes: it can be said by any elder person to a younger one; he quotes e.g. *Ph.* 193 (paidagogos to Antigone); cf. also *Hipp.* 203 (nurse to Phaidra), 611 (nurse to Hippolytos), *Heracl.* 539 (Iolaos to Makaria), *El.* 605 (old man to Orestes), 657 (old man to Elektra) etc. So we have several possibilities: (a) Merope to Kresphontes, (b) *senex* to Merope or Kresphontes, (c) chorus to Merope or Kresphontes (that is, if the chorus is old enough). This, together with the uncertainty as to the exact meaning of αἰδώc here (see below) and the fact that the line may well be gnomic, makes all attempts at location extremely hazardous. Webster 142 accepts Snell's version of the fragment and regards the line as "Merope's description of how she will behave towards Polyphontes"; for similar ideas cf. (apparently) Mette[5] 159 (F 612): "αἰδώc zeigt sich (nur?) in den Augen, Kind"; but see comm. below.

αἰδὼc ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖcι: this expression is proverbial and abundantly attested. Cf. *hDem.* 214f. ἐπί τοι πρέπει ὄμμαcιν αἰδὼc / καὶ χάριc (and Richardson ad loc.), Sapph. fr. 137, 5f. L-P, Thgn. 85f. οἷcιν ἐπὶ γλώccηι τε καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖcιν ἔπεcτιν / αἰδώc, perhaps A. fr. 279, 21ff. Ll.-J (= fr. 355, 21ff.

M), Ar. *Ve.* 446f. ἀλλὰ τούτοις γ'οὐκ ἔνι / οὐδ'ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖςιν αἰδὼς τῶν παλαιῶν ἐμβάδων (regarded by Musso[1] 88 and in his comm. ad loc. as a reminiscence of our fragment; but the expression is too proverbial to state any such thing), Arist. *Rh.* 1384 a 33 ὅθεν καὶ ἡ παροιμία τὸ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶναι αἰδῶ (and Sandys ad loc.), *Pr.* 957 b 11 ff.; 961 a 10 ff., A.R. 3, 92 f. ὑμείων γὰρ ἀναιδήτωι περ ἐόντι / τυτθὴ γ'αἰδὼς ἔςςετ' ἐν ὄμμαςιν; for ancient explanations of the proverb see *Appendix Proverbiorum* 1, 10 (*CPGr* 1, 381, 3 ff.); Suidas s.v. αἰδώς (2, 162 f. Adler). See further L. Malten, *Die Sprache des menschlichen Antlitzes im frühen Griechentum*, Berlin 1961, 24 f. and 29 f.; A. W. Bulloch, CQ 20, 1970, 270 f. (examples from Hellenistic poetry); J. Gould, JHS 93, 1973, 88 n. 74. There are also examples of the eyes as the seat of ἀναίδεια; cf. Longin. 4, 4 φαςὶν οὐδενὶ οὕτως ἐνςημαίνεςθαι τήν τινων ἀναίδειαν ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς (and Russell ad loc.), Call. fr. 186, 29; 368, A.R. 2, 407 and already *Il.* 1, 225 κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων.

In none of the examples we have any indication that the αἰδώς or ἀναίδεια is sham or only superficial (though, perhaps, Ar. *Ve.* 446 f. might be thus interpreted). We only find this idea in Theoc. 27, 69 f. ἔςτιχε ... / ὄμμαςιν αἰδομένοις, κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ἰάνθη and Paroem. L. 3, 26 (*CPGr* Suppl. VI [= H. Jungblut, RhM 38, 1883], 417) αἰδὼς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν κεῖται, πρὸς δὲ καρδίαν οὐ βέβηκεν, on which Snell's modification of fr. 457 was based. All we can say about this is that the distinction would be not unlike Euripides (cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 612), but nothing can be proved.

αἰδώς: the exact connotation of αἰδώς here cannot be discovered. In the proverbs quoted above I found no case where it meant 'shame' about a bad thing one has done (properly αἰςχύνη), but it rather suggests a respectful and decent attitude. Cf. also Barrett on *Hipp.* 244: "αἰδώς (...) is properly an inhibitory emotion — not (when it corresponds to our 'shame') the retrospective shame of a guilty conscience, but the shame that restrains one and keeps one's conscience clear". He adds that by the time of Euripides this distinction had got blurred (comparing *IT* 713, *HF* 1199 ff., *Hipp.* 772), but it seems as though in this proverb the original meaning of αἰδώς was well preserved. This should prevent us from regarding the fragment as a reference to Merope's shame after her attempt to kill her son. Nor does the expression seem likely to refer to the mock reconciliation, which would also require αἰδώς = αἰςχύνη. On αἰδώς in Euripides see further C. E. von Erffa, *ΑΙΔΩΣ und verwandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Demokrit*, Leipzig 1937, 131 ff.; S. Jaekel, Arctos 14, 1980, 22 ff.

ἐν: perhaps it is better to keep δ'ἐν, as the particle is far more likely to drop out than to creep in; cf. Luria 88 f.

ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖςι: the idea that the eyes are the medium for the expression of a certain state of mind is very common and easy to understand. Cf. e.g. Sapph. fr. 138, 2 L-P καὶ τὰν ἐπ' ὄςςοις' ὀμπέταςον χάριν (cf. *hDem.* 215, E.

fr. 736, 5), A. *Pers.* 168 ἀμφὶ δ'ὀφθαλμῶι φόβος, E. *Med.* 219 δίκη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν; and also Cic. *Off.* 1, 41, 146 *ex oculorum obtutu ... facile iudicabimus, quid eorum apte fiat, quid ab officio naturaque discrepet.* See further Gataker on M. Ant. 11, 15, 3 (p. 396); Sandys on Arist. *Rh.* 1384 a 32f.

*fr. 458 = 76 A

This fragment (which first appeared among the frs. of the *Kresphontes* in Barnes 2, 476 and has often been connected with frs. 454 and 455) has been almost unanimously placed in the mock reconciliation (cf. Welcker 2, 836 etc.; only Hartung 2, 51 and Mette[2] 67 had a different opinion, but without offering substantial arguments). Yet the fragment must probably be interpreted in a very different way: see below on 2 σοφὴν ἔθηκαν.

αἱ τύχαι: see comm. on *Arch.* fr. 19, 15 A.

μισθὸν λαβοῦσαι: 'taking as a fee'. It is tempting, in view of σοφὴν ἔθηκαν, to think that this is an allusion to the well-known practice of the Sophists to charge a fee for their teaching (cf. e.g. Pl. *Prt.* 349 a, *Cra.* 391 b; also Ar. *Nu.* 98, 245, 876). For an allusion to the Sophists cf. also *Hipp.* 921 δεινὸν σοφιστὴν εἶπας (and Barrett ad loc.) and perhaps fr. 189 ἐκ παντὸς ἄν τις πράγματος δισσῶν λόγων / ἀγῶνα θεῖτ'ἄν, εἰ λέγειν εἴη σοφός; for a 'veiled' allusion like in our fragment *Hec.* 816ff. Πειθὼ ... / ... σπουδάζομεν / μισθοὺς διδόντες μανθάνειν.

For the expression μισθὸν λαβοῦσαι we may compare e.g. *IT* 593, fr. 297, 2 and in prose Hdt. 8, 117, 1 and Th. 8, 83, 3; on μισθός in general cf. E. Will, *Notes sur ΜΙΣΘΟΣ*, in *Le monde grec. Hommages à C. Préaux*, Bruxelles 1975, 426-38.

τῶν ἐμῶν τὰ φίλτατα: τὰ φίλτατα is used in tragedy to indicate 'one's nearest and dearest' (LSJ s.v. φίλος I 1 c). It usually (but not necessarily) refers to one or more persons, who may be alive or dead. Cf. Page on *Med.* 16 (examples from Sophocles and Euripides, to which one may add A. *Pers.* 851 and *Eu.* 100). Here the expression is slightly different because of τῶν ἐμῶν: thus constructed we find τὰ φίλτατα in *Or.* 644f. χρήματ' ἣν ψυχὴν ἐμὴν / σώσῃς, ἅπερ μοι φίλτατ' ἐστὶ τῶν ἐμῶν, S. *OT* 1473f. Κρέων / ἔπεμψέ μοι τὰ φίλτατ' ἐκγόνοιν ἐμοῖν (Oidipus' daughters); cf. perhaps also *Alc.* 340 τῆς ἐμῆς τὰ φίλτατα / ψυχῆς ἔσωσας (my life?). There can be little doubt that Merope here means with τῶν ἐμῶν τὰ φίλτατα her husband and sons.

σοφὴν ἔθηκαν: without context it is of course not easy to guess the exact meaning of σοφὴν here. It has been generally thought that Merope is telling Polyphontes, in the mock reconciliation, that at last suffering has made her 'wise' and that she gives up struggling against him. It is rather unlikely, however, that σοφός in a fifth-century text could bear this meaning (cf. LSJ

s.v.): if Merope wanted to tell that she had become 'wise', cώφρονα would be the right word to use (cf. *Med.* 913). Coφόc on the other hand suggests a certain skill or cleverness, and this may also be implied by the context in Plutarch: διδάcκονται τὸ χρήcιμον 'they are taught what is useful' (cf. A. fr. 390).

Taking this into account I think that it is unlikely that (1) the fragment must be connected with frs. 454 and 455, (2) it is from the mock reconciliation. I should rather be inclined to look for a scene where it may be relevant to speak of some skill of Merope's. Now it may well be that this subject was touched upon in a scene in which the intrigue against Polyphontes was discussed: if a mechanema is called for in Euripides it is usually a woman who invents it. Cf. e.g. *IT* 1029 ff., *Hel.* 1049 ff. (1049 ἄκουcον, ἤν τι καὶ γυνὴ λέξηι cοφόν; cf. also 1528 f. cοφώταθ' ἁβρὸν πόδα τιθεῖc' ἀνέcτενε / πόcιν πέλαc παρόντα κοὐ τεθνηκότα and Kannicht ad loc.), *Hipp.* 480 f. ἦ τἄρ' ἂν ὀψέ γ' ἄνδρεc ἐξεύροιεν ἄν, / εἰ μὴ γυναῖκεc μηχανὰc εὑρήcομεν, *Andr.* 85 πολλὰc ἂν εὕροιc μηχανάc· γυνὴ γὰρ εἶ, *Med.* 1081-9, *Su.* 294; F. Solmsen, Phil. 87, 1932, 7. The fragment would then fit e.g. a plotting scene in which Kresphontes does not know what to do, but Merope does.

fr. 459 = 77 A

Various attempts have been made to locate this fragment, but, as its contents are gnomic, not much certainty can be reached. Some scholars have regarded the lines as a comment on the fate of Polyphontes: so Welcker 2, 839 (spoken by chorus), Basedow 32 f., Wecklein 15 (spoken by Kresphontes), Vysoký 9 (spoken by messenger), Musso[6] ad loc. (spoken by messenger or chorus). None of these possibilities can be refuted: moralizing remarks of the chorus are amply attested; of characters in the play we find them towards the end of the play in e.g. *Andr.* 1279 ff., *HF* 1425 f.; for moralizing comments at the end of a messenger's speech cf. e.g. *Med.* 1224 ff., *Su.* 726 ff. (with Collard ad loc.), *Hel.* 1617 f. (with Kannicht ad loc.).

A different view was held by Hartung 2, 51 and Cengarle 72, who believed that the lines referred to Kresphontes and were spoken by Merope resp. the chorus. Cengarle argued that κέρδη indicated the reward offered by Polyphontes to the murderer of young Kresphontes (cf. test. 5, 6) and added that the lines could not refer to Polyphontes, because it is said in fr. 66, 22 A that his reason for killing Kresphontes Sr. was that he wanted to be *king*, whereas κέρδη in his opinion suggest riches. Now certainly the inclusion of our fragment in Stob. 4, 31 (ΠΕΡΙ ΠΛΟΥΤΟΥ) shows that the anthologist wants us to regard κέρδη here as financial profits, but it is quite possible that in the context of the Kresphontes it covered more than just that (cf. comm. on *Arch.* fr. 256, 2 κέρδοc), i.e. riches, power, being king, getting Merope as his wife.

For other attempts cf. Webster 142 (Merope in mock reconciliation), Bothe 158 and Mette[2] 67 (quarrel Merope-Polyphontes).

Still, these suggestions do not exhaust the possibilities: cf. H. Friis Johansen, *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis*, Copenhagen 1959, 151-9 (on 'conclusive reflections').

In the mss. of Stobaeus there is no separation between this fragment and the following ecloga μή μοί ποτ' εἴη χρημάτων νικωμένωι / κακὸν γενέcθαι, μηδ' ὁμιλοίην κακοῖc. But the second ecloga also occurs in 4, 31^{c}, 57 with the lemma Εὐριπίδου Δίκτυϊ (= fr. 341) and has been separated from our fragment by Meineke: rightly, I think, because, apart from the indication offered by the lemma in 4, 31^{c}, 57, the fragments are clearly two separate statements (if they are connected, the asyndeton and change of thought are unbearably harsh) and mistakes of this type are very common in the mss. of Stobaeus (cf. for a similar case 4, 31^{b}, 39-40 [*Heracl.* 745-7 joined to fr. 462] and for more false lemmata Luria 85 ff.). (Cengarle 72 wants to keep all four lines in the *Kresphontes*, but fails to give a satisfactory interpretation of the text).

τινα ... βροτῶν: for τιc thus constructed with a gen. plur. in a general command or advice cf. Pi. fr. 109, 1 f. τὸ κοινόν τιc ἀcτῶν ἐν εὐδίαι / τιθεὶc ἐρευναcάτω μεγαλάνοροc Ἡcυχίαc τὸ φαιδρὸν φαόc, S. F 593 ζώοι τιc ἀνθρώπων τὸ κατ' ἦμαρ ὅπωc / ἥδιcτα πορcύνων· τὸ δ'ἐc αὔριον αἰεὶ / τυφλὸν ἕρπει; for single τιc in commands, meaning 'any one concerned, every one' cf. LSJ s.v. τιc A II 2. There seems to be no need for emendation, as F. W. Schmidt and Walker[1] suggested (Walker's βροτόν would be against normal tragic idiom anyway, cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 1316-7).

ἐφ' οἷcι ... cτένειν: cf. *Hyps.* fr. 64 II 89 μὴ cτέν' ἐπ' εὐτυχίαιcιν; *Hipp.* 903 ἐφ' ὅτινι cτένειc is probably corrupt (cf. Barrett ad loc.).

ARCHELAOS

INTRODUCTION

1. The play

1.1 The date of the *Archelaos*

The main piece of evidence for the dating of the *Archelaos* is test. 1 ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰϲ Μακεδονίαν παρὰ Ἀρχέλαον γενόμενοϲ διέτριψε (sc. Euripides) καὶ χαριζόμενοϲ αὐτῶι δρᾶμα ὁμωνύμωϲ ἔγραψε [1] from which it appears that Euripides wrote this play during his stay in Macedonia, thereby 'pleasing' his host Archelaos of Macedonia (who reigned ca. 413-399 B.C.); cf. also the allusions in test. 2 and 3 (for details see comm. on these testimonia). A *terminus post quem* is therefore provided by Euripides' departure from Athens, which must have been after the performance of the *Orestes* at the Dionysia of 408 B.C. (cf. *TrGF* I DID C 19: according to our records this was the last contest in Athens in which Euripides himself took part). A *terminus ante quem* is provided by Euripides' death, which according to the *Marmor Parium* took place in 407/6 B.C. (*TrGF* I DID D 1 A 63), and if we can trust the story of Sophocles appearing in mourning at the Dionysia of 406 B.C. (*vit. Eur.* 2 [1, 3, 11 ff. Schwartz] = *TrGF* I DID C 20 = S. T 54) cannot be dated later than the early spring of 406 B.C.

Sometime in 408/7 B.C., therefore, the *Archelaos* must have been produced;

[1] I have followed the traditional interpretation of the passage, but one should bear in mind that the *Vita* may not be the most reliable source for the dating of a play. Cf. M. R. Lefkowitz, GRBS 20, 1979, 209, who states that "any dating based on the biography must be questioned" (after arguing that most of the information in the *Vita* derives from comedy or inferences from Euripides' own plays [194 ff.]) and suggests for instance that the references to Pieria and the Lydias valley in *Ba.* 409 ff. and 565 ff., which have been used to support the idea that the play was written in Macedonia, may just as well have given rise to this very notion of the exile in Macedonia (cf. also M. R. Lefkowitz, CQ 28, 1978, 466 on the motif of exile as a recurrent element in the 'mythical' narratives of the *Vitae*; and in general M. R. Lefkowitz, *The lives of the Greek poets*, London 1981). *Mutatis mutandis* the same could be said about the *Archelaos*: the fact that Euripides wrote a play *Archelaos*, celebrating the founder of the Macedonian dynasty (which, in itself, might fit in nicely with the pro-Macedonian mood in Athens shortly before his death; see intr. 1.5), may have caused the notion of his going to Macedonia and being friendly with Archelaos. If so, it is still quite conceivable that the play was inspired by the historical Archelaos, and there is no need to change the traditional dating. Yet, as Euripides' journey to Macedonia was firmly believed in all through antiquity and would be by no means exceptional or unusual, because many artists were gathered at the court of Archelaos, I think we require solid evidence to the contrary before renouncing the belief (a new bit of didascalia for instance).

cf. also *TrGF* 1 p. 17 "Pella 408/7" [2]. I do not think it worthwhile to deal here which such theories as demand that the *Archelaos* was already (partly) written in Athens: they seem to be invented to explain the presumed parody of the *Archelaos* in Ar. *Ra.* 1206 ff. and have nothing to support them [3] (see intr. to fr. 228); Girard 160 suggests that the *Archelaos* was produced in the same year in which Euripides left for Macedonia (thereby referring to older literature, e.g. Nestle[1] 18), i.e. in 408 B.C., but I do not think that the evidence permits us to go beyond 408/7 B.C. This late date is supported by the metre of the fragments (though this criterion should be used only with great caution if one is dealing with fragments; see intr. *Kresphontes* 1.1); cf. Zielinski 221 f.; Siegmann 2.

1.2 The place of performance

As to the actual place of performance of the *Archelaos*, we cannot state any place with certainty. First of all it should be noted that we do not possess any evidence (from the didascalia or otherwise) [4] that the *Archelaos* was ever produced at Athens, whereas the remark in test. 1 seems to justify the assumption that the play was produced in Macedonia, a point on which scholars generally agree (but cf. intr. 1.1 n. 1). Production in Macedonia being granted there still remains the problem of the actual place of production. There are three serious candidates:

(1) Pella; so e.g. Siegmann 2, Austin 11, Snell in *TrGF* 1 p. 17, Lowicka 264. But this is far from certain: (a) it presupposes that Archelaos moved the royal residence from Aigai to Pella, but we have no certain evidence that it was Archelaos who made this move (it is merely assumed because of X. *HG* 5, 2, 13 Πέλλαν, ἥπερ μεγίστη τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίαι πόλεων), and if he did so, there are good reasons for believing that he did so only towards the end of his reign (cf. Hammond-Griffith 6; 139 f.), (b) it does not seem very likely, even if Archelaos moved to Pella, that this took place before the production of the *Archelaos*, which ended with an oracle on the foundation of Aigai (cf. test. 7, 12 ff.) [5].

---

[2] Here Snell also adduces Sat. *vit. Eur.* fr. 39 col. XIX as evidence, but I cannot very well see how this can be done, because the column only contains (1) a general remark on the appreciation of Euripides in Macedonia (6 ff.), (2) a doubtful reference to Archelaos (35 f.; where see Hunt).

[3] On Kuiper's inference from Sat. *vit. Eur.* fr. 39 col. XV ff. that the *Archelaos* was written before Euripides left Athens (K. Kuiper, Mnem. N.S. 41, 1913, 242) see app. 2 B 3.

[4] But, as all relevant lists show gaps about the time when the *Archelaos* has been dated (cf. *TrGF* 1 DID A), 'absence from the didascalia' cannot be used as a positive argument against production at Athens.

[5] But this argument should not be pushed too far as long as we do not know the exact text and impact of the oracle.

(2) Aigai; so Van Herwerden[2] 318, whose main argument for preferring Aigai to Dion (see below) is the mention of the foundation of Aigai. He thinks this would be more impressive in Aigai than elsewhere. He may be right. But when Ridgeway 7f., Hammond-Griffith 150 postulate an ancient festival at Aigai, they seem to have been misled by a mistake of Arrian; cf. Bosworth on Arr. *An.* 1, 11, 1 (and in CQ 26, 1976, 119ff.).

(3) Dion; so Girard 160; Goossens 672 n. 22. It is well attested that Archelaos founded a dramatic festival in honour of Zeus and the Muses, the Olympia, at Dion (cf. D.S. 17, 16, 3-4 and for further references Bosworth on Arr. *An.* 1, 11, 1; Hammond-Griffith 150f.). This festival was probably meant as an imitation of similar Greek festivals and part of Archelaos' attempts at Hellenization[6]. So the idea that a play celebrating Archelaos' Greek descendance was produced at these Olympia is rather attractive.

1.3 Later performances

As to later performances we have certain evidence that in III B.C. the *Archelaos* was reproduced at the Heraia in Argos and the Naïa in Dodona; cf. test. 4. On the possibility that *PHamb.* 118 was part of the textbook of some Dionysiac artist, which might imply that the prologue was sometimes recited separately, see intr. 3.1.

1.4 Trilogy ?

It has been suggested by Zielinski 236 that the *Archelaos* was the last play of a trilogy *Temenos-Temenidai-Archelaos*. This idea was obviously based on the titles and subject-matter of the plays and considered to be supported by their metre (pointing to a late date for all three; cf. also Schmid *GGL* I 3, 629f.; Webster 252f.), but none of these arguments is very impressive: metre of course is a very uncertain guide with fragments (for criticism of Webster's methods in these matters cf. Matthiessen[2] 28) and so are titles and subject-matter. The latter might be used if we were dealing with Aeschylus, but with Euripides the evidence that he ever wrote a trilogy of which the plays were connected by their subject-matter is scanty: only about the trilogy *Alexandros-Palamedes-Troades* (and perhaps its satyr-play *Sisyphos*), produced in 415 we can assert such a thing; cf. recently R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Hypomnemata 60), Göttingen 1980. Apart from this we possess some evidence that connected trilogies at the end of the fifth century were not entirely out of the question: Scodel 17 points to the possibility of a connected trilogy in Euripides' *Oinomaos-Chrysippos-Phoinissai* (produced in 410/9? cf. *TrGF* 1 DID C 16), adduces a few bits of further evidence (of which she

[6] Cf. also Geyer 100.

admits that it is poor) from other authors and draws attention to the possibility that Euripides at some time could write a connected trilogy in conscious imitation of Aeschylus (cf. also Schmid *GGL* I 3, 777 who claims for Euripides' later years "Trilogien, die in zeitlicher Abfolge drei Epochen eines grossen Sagenzusammenhangs darstellten" and mentions *Temenos-Temenidai-Archelaos* among his examples in n. 3). On the other hand we have abundant evidence that Euripides did not hesitate to pick up related subjects at different times in his career, as e.g. the theme of 'the Trojan women' in *Andr.*, *Hec.* and *Tr.*, 'Herakles and his offspring' in *Heracl.* and *HF*, 'the children of Agamemnon' in *El.*, *IT*, *Or.* and *IA* (one wonders: if of these plays too we had only the titles and a few fragments, how many connected trilogies Euripides would then be said to have written ...?). Another point to be remembered is that we have no evidence that in Macedonia too plays were performed in trilogies (cf. Van Herwerden[2] 325; Girard 161). The above-said of course merely shows that a trilogy is not at first sight likely or necessary, but cannot be regarded as 'proof' against such a trilogy. More important, therefore, are the inferences that can be drawn from the papyri:

(1) if the *Archelaos* was the last play of a connected trilogy one would not expect the long genealogy of *PHamb.* 118a in the prologue of this last play; cf. Siegmann 9. Webster 252f. argues against this: "A possible answer is that for performance in the Macedonian capital the pedigree had to be given in this play just because this play gave the ancestry of the king" (cf. also Lowicka 266), but this does not solve the difficulty: *if* a trilogy *Temenos-Temenidai-Archelaos* was performed in Macedonia, it would be necessary to give a good deal of genealogical information in the *first* play in order to make the Macedonian audience understand what it was all about. If then this very piece of information turns up in what should be the last play, we must infer either that Euripides repeated it all over again (which, I think, is highly unlikely) or that the play in question was not the third play at all, but an independent play;

(2) the identification of *PMich.* inv. 1319, in which Archelaos is grown up and fighting in a battle *before* Temenos' return to Argos, as part of the hypothesis of *Temenos* or *Temenidai* (for details see app. 2 C 2) makes the idea of a connected trilogy very difficult to maintain, because in the *Archelaos* Archelaos seems to have been born only *after* Temenos' return to Argos. Cf. fr. 2, 17ff. A, where, I think, the most natural interpretation of the text is that Temenos first returned to Argos and then went to Dodona to ask about children. Such a difference would not be disturbing at all in plays which were produced separately[7], but seems inconceivable within a trilogy;

(3) Webster 253 observed that in *POxy.* 27, 2455 fr. 11 (which must be

[7] Cf. on such variations of 'minor facts' Grube 31 f., who gives more examples.

from the hypothesis of either *Temenos* or *Temenidai*) the sons of Temenos are mentioned in a context which makes it clear that they were grown up before the return to Argos: it is hard to see how this can be reconciled with the statement in fr. 2, 19 A ἀπαιδίαι ... χρώμενος of Temenos after the return to Argos (Webster wanted to solve the difficulty by letting Temenos marry again and want a child from his second wife, but that seems fanciful and does not account for ἀπαιδίαι).

I think these arguments are sufficient to reject the idea of a trilogy *Temenos-Temenidai-Archelaos*.

1.5 Special background of the play

If we may believe the statement in the *Euripides-vita* (test. 1), the *Archelaos* was written 'to please Archelaos'. This fits in nicely with the summary in Hyginus (test. 7), which contains several elements that can be considered as pleasing to the king: (1) descent from Herakles, which made him part of the heroic tradition of Greece (the importance of this descendance in the play is now confirmed by *PHamb*. 118 a), (2) Archelaos in the play appears to have been a brave young man, showing himself a worthy descendant of Herakles, (3) at the command of Apollo this Archelaos became the founder of the old Macedonian capital Aigai. All this glory must have been felt to be somehow reflected on his historical name-sake. Yet, it is equally conceivable that this play and plot were devised not merely to please the vanity of Archelaos, but to fit in with the more general tendency towards Hellenization of the Macedonians: from their part this was obviously a longstanding wish, whereas in Athens the political situation of the late fifth century B.C. made Macedonia desirable as an ally and thereby worthy of being raised to the level of genuine Greeks; for details see below.

Several scholars have interpreted the statement in the *Vita* as an indication that the *Archelaos* was written with the purpose to flatter or perhaps to educate or legitimate Archelaos[8]. So e.g. Van Herwerden[2] 310 and 341 f., who argues that the play was written to justify the way in which Archelaos came to power, i.e. it had to suggest that the real Archelaos had killed his relatives out of self-defence, just as Archelaos in the play killed Kisseus. Van Herwerden explicitly based his theory on the story in Plato (*Grg*. 471 a-d)[9], but we have no evidence that this was current already at the time when the *Archelaos* was written (on the date of composition of the *Gorgias* see Dodds intr. 18 ff.) nor can we be certain that all this malignant gossip was true in

[8] Starting, apparently from the notion that Archelaos was morally bad, derived from Pl. *Grg*. 470 c - 471 d.

[9] For similar ideas cf. more recently Dascalakis 107 f.

detail (cf. Geyer 84f.; Hammond-Griffith 137 n. 1). As long as we do not know how much objective truth there was behind Plato's story we cannot tell whether the *Archelaos* was meant as a personal legitimation of the king[10]. Others have regarded the 'purpose' of the *Archelaos* as educational; so Nauhardt 80 (both legitimation and education, Euripides showing "dass die wahre Legitimation in der—im modernen Sinne verstandenen—ἀρετή liegt"), Lowicka 271 ("this play, full of moral pathos, had also to show the half-barbarian Macedonian public an ideal picture of the Greek understanding of duties by ordinary people and by rulers").

These interpretations have in common that they are all focusing on the person of Archelaos, and, of course, this is reasonable enough, as Euripides must have had his reasons for chosing his name-sake as the principal character of the play (and not some Perdikkas or Karanos[11]). Yet, we have no means to judge whether his 'purpose' went beyond a general notion of 'pleasing Archelaos', and *if* it did, it was probably of a more general nature (not education etc.). Although I cannot 'prove' anything, I think it is worth mentioning the possibility that the play was celebrating the Greek ancestry of Archelaos and at the same time elevating the Macedonians in general, in order to connect them more closely with Athens. There are a few things that can be adduced to support this supposition: (1) it fits in with the Macedonian and Athenian tendencies: in Macedonia there had been claims to Greek ancestry long before Archelaos (cf. the story of Alexander I proving himself a Greek from Argos at the Olympic Games in Hdt. 5, 22 and intr. 2.1) and at the Macedonian court Greek artists had been entertained already by Perdikkas II, a habit now taken over by Archelaos (cf. Geyer 97ff.; Hammond-Griffith 149 + notes); Macedonian coinage during the reign of Archelaos points in the same direction, showing the head and attributes of Herakles (cf. Hammond-Griffith 138). On the other hand the Athenians must have been quite willing, during this last decade of the fifth century, to accept and promote the Macedonian tendency towards Hellenization, as Macedonia was becoming an important and useful ally against Sparta (cf. Geyer 92f.; Hammond-Griffith 137ff.); (2) the situation described in (1) is one with which the conception of a play like the *Archelaos* would agree very well: on the tendency of the Greeks to elevate (half-)barbarian peoples by way of connecting them with characters from their own mythology and put the resulting synthesis at the service of political propaganda, cf. Nilsson[2] 96ff., who gives

---

[10] Surely Athenian public opinion was generally in favour of Archelaos (cf. Dodds on Pl. *Grg.* 470c9-471d2). It is therefore unlikely that his being king still needed elaborate justification.

[11] On whom see below intr. 2.1.

several examples of this practice[12] and also reckons the myths about the Macedonian royal house to this group (99ff.).

All things considered I find this interpretation more attractive than those of Van Herwerden, Lowicka etc. *If* we assume with Lefkowitz (cf. intr. 1.1 n. 1) that the *Archelaos* was not written in Macedonia at all, this would provide a way of explaining how Euripides got at the subject while in Athens.

A parallel may be Theodektes' *Mausolos*, but we know too little of the play to be certain; see on test. 2. Cf. perhaps also *Andr.* 1243ff., where the reference to Molossia has been regarded as a topical allusion, fitting in with the pro-Athenian tendencies of the Molossian king Tharyps after 429 B.C.; cf. Stevens intr. *Andr.* p. 17; Schmid *GGL* I 3, 405 (the latter argues that the *Andr.* was actually performed in Molossia). A more remote parallel may be Virgil's *Aeneid*, which in a comparable way was meant to connect the Romans and their imperial family with the gods and heroes of Homer and where Aeneas, the mythical founder of Rome, is presented as ancestor of Augustus[13].

2. Contents of the play

2.1 Summary of contents; the myth

(The following summary is only a short paraphrase of test. 7, which I give here in order that features of the play which are mentioned in the introduction shall be at once clear also to those who are not familiar with the play's contents).

Archelaos, son of Temenos, was exiled from Argos by his brothers and went to Thracia, to king Kisseus, who happened to be at war with neighbouring peoples and promised Archelaos his kingdom and daughter if he could protect him against his enemies (Archelaos being a descendant of Herakles). Archelaos subsequently defeated the enemies and went to ask the king for his promised reward. The king, however, persuaded by his friends, broke his promise and intended to kill Archelaos by treachery. He therefore gave orders to prepare a pitfall (filled with burning coals) to trap Archelaos. But a slave of the king told Archelaos about the plot, and Archelaos asked for a secret interview with the king: when alone with Kisseus he threw him

---

[12] E.g. Th. 2, 29, 3 where Thucydides, in a chapter on the Athenian desire to get the Thracian king Sitalkes, son of Teres, as an ally, elaborately points out that this Teres has nothing to do with the Tereus who married the Athenian Prokne; such an elaborate refutation of the connection seems to be best explained if the connection had indeed been made.

[13] On the influence of Greek foundation-myths on contents and structure of the *Aeneid* cf. B. Schmid 189ff.

into the pitfall and thus killed him. He then fled to Macedonia, led by a goat, according to some command of Apollo, and founded the city of Aigai, called after the goat.

It has been generally thought that the myth of Archelaos was a creation of Euripides and that he had invented Archelaos for the purpose of the play (cf. e.g. Van Herwerden² 310). Now the first idea can still be accepted, though with the restriction that we do possess independent evidence of the foundation myths of Macedonia which contains a number of elements that recur in the *Archelaos* and may well have been used by Euripides (see below). The second idea, however, can no longer be maintained, now that Archelaos is also attested for *Temenos* and/or *Temenidai* (see app. 2 C 1 and 2). Whether we have to infer from this that Archelaos already 'existed' as a character in the myths of the return of the Heraclids[14] or that Euripides still invented him, but used him in several plays, is a matter which cannot be settled[15]. But in the latter case, it should be noticed, there would be an odd coincidence: if Archelaos was invented by Euripides for *Temenos* and/or *Temenidai* it seems almost too good to be true that Euripides should have invented a character which would come in so handy when he went to write the *Archelaos*; unless, of course, *Temenos* and *Temenidai* too were composed with an eye on the historical Archelaos, but that seems hardly likely unless the three plays formed a coherent trilogy; but see intr. 1.4 on the improbability of such a trilogy.

A few points should be noticed, although they do not lead to any conclusions:

(1) the special position of Archelaos as indicated by test. 7, 1 *a fratribus eiectus* recalls another son of Temenos, generally called Agraios *vel sim.* (cf. Robert² 2, 666 ff.) who is said to have disagreed with the murderous plans of his brothers against Temenos (e.g. Paus. 2, 28, 3 Ἀγαίωι γὰρ τῶι νεωτάτωι τὰ ποιούμενα οὐκ ἤρεσκεν, Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 30; cf. Robert² 2, 669 n. 3; Siegmann 7);

---

[14] On which see Robert² 2, 656 ff. and recently Prinz 206-313; an early existence of Archelaos is presupposed by Kinzl in K. H. Kinzl (ed.), *Die ältere Tyrannis bis zu den Perserkriegen* (*WdF* 510), Darmstadt 1979, 304, who suggests that when Kleisthenes of Sikyon (early VI B.C.) renamed the Sikyonian tribes as part of his campaign against Argos (cf. Hdt. 5, 67-68) he named his own tribe the Ἀρχέλαοι after the 'dissident' Archelaos, i.e. after an eponymous hero rather than after an abstraction (as suggested by Hdt. 5, 68, 1 ταύτηι [sc. his own tribe] δὲ τὸ οὔνομα ἀπὸ τῆς ἑωυτοῦ ἀρχῆς ἔθετο). But this is very hypothetical, and even if Archelaos figured in the Heraclid myths as early as that we have no reason to assume that he had always been a dissident.

[15] In itself the idea of flattering a king by the invention of a mythical character of the same name may have an early precedent in the *Telegony* of the Cyrenean poet Eugammon (VI B.C.), who gave one of Odysseus' sons the name Arkesilaos, i.e. the same name as several kings of Cyrene; cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1884, 184; Nilsson² 98 f.

(2) in Apollod. 2, 8, 5 the sons of Temenos are called Ἀγέλαον καὶ Εὐρύπυλον καὶ Καλλίαν and the order in which they are named suggests that Agelaos is the eldest (like Archelaos). Now the names Ἀγέλαοϲ and Ἀρχέλαοϲ are much alike and confusion seems possible: we find this type of confusion with the name of the slave of Priam who had to expose Paris: he is called Ἀγέλαοϲ in Apollod. 3, 12, 5 (cf. Heyne ad loc.), Ἀρχέλαοϲ in Tzetzes Σ Lyc. 138 and Σ *Il.* 3, 325 has †ἀρχιάλαϲ† ("erat forte ἀρχέλαοϲ [Tz.]" Erbse). O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, München 1906, 2, 1199 n. 4 used this parallel in support of his idea that Agelaos and Archelaos are the same son of Temenos. The identification now wins further support from the contents of *PMich.* inv. 1319 (app. 2 C 2) where we find Archelaos fighting in the battle preceding the return to Argos, and winning the kingship by his bravery; the story in Apollod. 2, 8, 5 may well give the sequence of that story: Temenos after all preferred to give the royal power to his son-in-law Deiphontes and was killed by his own sons; the *army* then decided that Deiphontes should be king (the military context helps to bring both stories together; cf. also Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 30, 6 where the dying Temenos is brought εἰϲ τὸ ϲτράτευμα). If this connection of Apollod. 2, 8, 5 with app. 2 C 2 is right, the Apollodorean Agelaos must be identified with the Archelaos of *Temenos* or *Temenidai*, not with our Archelaos. (There seems to be no need for the suggestion of J. S. Rusten, ZPE 40, 1980, 41 f. that we should read Ἀγ⟨ραῖον ἢ Ἀρχ⟩έλαον; in fact it is rather unlikely, as Agraios is elsewhere the youngest son, who took no part in the murder; see above).

As to the actual story of the *Archelaos* it is a plausible guess that this has been invented by Euripides. Yet, it is also clear from other sources that certain traditional elements of the myths on the foundation of Aigai and the ancestry of the Macedonian kings formed the frame-work of his story (cf. also Van Herwerden² 315 f.):

(1) the idea that the Macedonian kings were descendants of the Temenids from Argos we find also in independent sources[16]: cf. Hdt. 5, 22 (where see Stein on Ἀργεῖοϲ); 8, 137-139 (on which see below); Th. 2, 99, 3; 5, 80, 2 and the survey of the Macedonian genealogies in *FGrH* II B 401 f.; on these claims of the Macedonian kings cf. in general Rosen 5 ff.; Hammond-Griffith 3 ff.[17];

---

[16] Dascalakis 98 argues that the first piece of evidence for the Greek descent of the Macedonians is A. *Supp.* 250 ff.

[17] According to some scholars these claims were inspired by the existence of another Argos (Ἄργοϲ Ὀρεϲτικόν) in Macedonia, after which the royal house was called that of the Argeadae according to Appian. *Syr.* 63, 333; so first O. Abel, *Makedonien vor König Philipp*, Leipzig 1847, 95. Recently this idea has been strongly rejected by Dascalakis 110 ff., Hammond-Griffith 3 n. 1 (cf. also Geyer 37 f., with references to older literature); for a detailed discussion of the matter cf. also Rosen 8 ff.

(2) in Hdt. 8, 137-138 we find a story of how three descendants of Temenos came to Macedonia and founded there a new kingdom: 137 Τοῦ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τούτου ἕβδομος γενέτωρ Περδίκκης ἐστὶ ὁ κτησάμενος τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα τρόπωι τοιῶιδε· ἐξ Ἄργεος ἔφυγον ἐς Ἰλλυριοὺς τῶν Τημένου ἀπογόνων τρεῖς ἀδελφεοί, Γαυάνης τε καὶ Ἀέροπος καὶ Περδίκκης, ἐκ δὲ Ἰλλυριῶν ὑπερβαλόντες ἐς τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίην ἀπίκοντο ἐς Λεβαίην πόλιν. (2) ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἐθήτευον ἐπὶ μισθῶι παρὰ τῶι βασιλέϊ, ὁ μὲν ἵππους νέμων, ὁ δὲ βοῦς, ὁ δὲ νεώτατος αὐτῶν Περδίκκης τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων. ἦσαν δὲ τὸ πάλαι καὶ αἱ τυραννίδες τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενέες χρήμασι, οὐ μοῦνον ὁ δῆμος. ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τοῦ βασιλέος αὐτὴ τὰ σιτία σφι ἔπεσσε. (3) ὅκως δὲ ὀπτώιη, ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ θητός, τοῦ Περδίκκεω, διπλήσιος ἐγίνετο αὐτὸς ἑωυτοῦ. ἐπεὶ δὲ αἰεὶ τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ἐγίνετο, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἑωυτῆς. τὸν δὲ ἀκούσαντα ἐσῆλθε αὐτίκα ὡς εἴη τέρας καὶ φέροι ἐς μέγα τι. καλέσας δὲ τοὺς θῆτας προηγόρευέ σφι ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἐκ γῆς τῆς ἑωυτοῦ. (4) οἱ δὲ τὸν μισθὸν ἔφασαν δίκαιοι εἶναι ἀπολαβόντες οὕτως ἐξιέναι. ἐνθαῦτα ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ μισθοῦ πέρι ἀκούσας, ἦν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν καπνοδόκην ἐς τὸν οἶκον ἐσέχων ὁ ἥλιος, εἶπε θεοβλαβὴς γενόμενος 'Μισθὸν δὲ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ ὑμέων ἄξιον τόνδε ἀποδίδωμι', δέξας τὸν ἥλιον. (5) ὁ μὲν δὴ Γαυάνης τε καὶ ὁ Ἀέροπος οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔστασαν ἐκπεπληγμένοι, ὡς ἤκουσαν ταῦτα· ὁ δὲ παῖς, ἐτύγχανε γὰρ ἔχων μάχαιραν, εἴπας τάδε 'Δεκόμεθα, ὦ βασιλεῦ, τὰ διδοῖς', περιγράφει τῆι μαχαίρηι ἐς τὸ ἔδαφος τοῦ οἴκου τὸν ἥλιον, περιγράψας δέ, ἐς τὸν κόλπον τρὶς ἀρυσάμενος τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀπαλλάσσετο αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ μετ' ἐκείνου. 138 οἱ μὲν δὴ ἀπήισαν, τῶι δὲ βασιλέϊ σημαίνει τις τῶν παρέδρων οἷόν τι χρῆμα ποιήσειε ὁ παῖς καὶ ὡς σὺν νόωι κείνων ὁ νεώτατος λάβοι τὰ διδόμενα. ὁ δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούσας καὶ ὀξυνθεὶς πέμπει ἐπ'αὐτοὺς ἱππέας ἀπολέοντας. ποταμὸς δέ ἐστι ἐν τῆι χώρηι ταύτηι, τῶι θύουσι οἱ τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἀπόγονοι ⟨ὡς⟩ σωτῆρι. (2) οὗτος, ἐπείτε διέβησαν οἱ Τημενίδαι, μέγας οὕτως ἐρρύη ὥστε τοὺς ἱππέας μὴ οἵους τε γενέσθαι διαβῆναι. οἱ δὲ ἀπικόμενοι ἐς ἄλλην γῆν τῆς Μακεδονίης οἴκησαν πέλας τῶν κήπων τῶν λεγομένων εἶναι Μίδεω τοῦ Γορδίεω ... (3) ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν κήπων ὄρος κεῖται Βέρμιον οὔνομα, ἄβατον ὑπὸ χειμῶνος. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὁρμώμενοι ὡς ταύτην ἔσχον, κατεστρέφοντο καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην.

It is at once apparent that our *Archelaos* has many elements in common with this story, which is our oldest record on the foundation of Macedonia [18] and likely to derive from local Macedonian tradition [19]: like Archelaos Perdikkas was a Temenid and had to fly from Argos (though with his brothers) and came to serve a foreign king, who tried to cheat him of his

[18] For a general discussion see Rosen 10 ff.
[19] Cf. also Dascalakis 100, Hammond-Griffith 11.

wages; he too had to fly again (to another part of Macedonia), after which he settled down; the 'goat-theme' is also present in this story (though not so prominent as in the *Archelaos*) because Perdikkas tended τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων (goats and sheep). The connection between this story and the *Archelaos* has long been recognized (cf. e.g. Van Herwerden² 315f.; Momigliano 204f.); the difference between the two versions has been pointed out by Aly 196f., who shows that the story in Herodotus is a typical example of a folk-tale[20] (cf. also Aly 237) and contrasts this with the *Archelaos*: "Es ist ausserordentlich belehrend, die frische, phantastische Art des echten Märchens mit der ausgeklügelten und von allen Orten zusammengeborgten Handlung des Euripideischen Archelaos zu vergleichen" (196). Not a very kind judgment, but it shows where the difference lies. In the *Archelaos* the essential elements recur, but adapted to the tragic genre and placed on a more 'noble' level: one founder of the dynasty, of explicit nobility (cf. *PHamb.* 118a) and led by oracles; on the question whether Euripides invented this variant or was inspired by the similar myth of Karanos and on the absence of the oracle in Herodotus' story see below (on Euripides' modifications of the story see also Momigliano 204f.);

(3) an etymological oracle on the foundation of Aigai (which popular etymology related to αἶγες 'goats'[21]) is an important element in records of the 'early history' of Macedonia[22]. The relevant oracles are: (a) an oracle given to Karanos[23]: 225 P-W (= L 50 Fontenrose) φράζεο, δῖε Καρανέ, νόωι δ'ἐμὸν ἔνθεο μῦθον· / ἐκπρολιπὼν Ἄργος τε καὶ Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα / χώρει πρὸς πηγὰς Ἁλιάκμονος· ἔνθα δ'ἂν αἶγας / βοσκομένας ἐσίδῃς πρῶτον, τότε τοι χρεὼν ἐστιν / ζηλωτὸν ναίειν αὐτὸν γενεάν τε πρόπασαν. This oracle does not mention the actual foundation of a town called Aigai, but it is likely that that is what is meant. The story of Karanos does in certain respects recall the story of Archelaos: in the source of the oracle, Σ Clem. Al. *Protr.* 11, 8 it is told how Karanos wanted to send a colony from Argos to Macedonia and then got this oracle from Apollo. Further details about this colonization are given by Justinus 7, 1, 7ff.: when arrived in Macedonia Karanos captured Edessa (on which see G. Huxley, GRBS 24, 1983, 253-257), which was not well protected because of the bad weather. He followed a herd

---

[20] But for a somewhat different interpretation see H. Kleinknecht, *Herodot und die Makedonische Urgeschichte*, Hermes 94, 1966, 134-146.

[21] There are many places called Aigai (cf. e.g. G. Huxley, GRBS 10, 1969, 5-11) and the etymology is uncertain. A connection with 'waves', 'water' has been claimed; so Dascalakis 104 + n. 19; doubtful Frisk s.v. αἰγιαλός, W. Spoerri in *LFrGrE* s.v. Αἰγαί E (who suggests a non-Indo-European origin).

[22] Cf. on this type of oracles in general Parke-Wormell 1, 63ff. and my comm. on test. 7, 13-14.

[23] Also a descendant of Temenos, who became firmly established in the Macedonian genealogies (cf. *FGrH* II B 401f., Hammond-Griffith 12ff.

of goats seeking shelter from the rain *reuocatusque in memoriam oraculi, quo iussus erat ducibus capris imperium quaerere, regni sedem statuit* and called it Aigai[24]. Strictly speaking this presupposes a slightly different oracle from that quoted above, because that does not mention any guiding. Even so, it is clear that both accounts refer basically to the same event[25]. Another version of the story is given by Syncellus 198a-c: Karanos arrived in Macedonia, became an ally of the king of the Orestae and fought with him against the neighbouring people, the Eordani, was rewarded with half their territory, took Macedonia as well and founded a city according to an oracle; a similar story is given by Eus. *Chron.* 1, 227 (cf. D.S. 7, 15, 1), but without an oracle, which is here reserved for the later expansion of his descendant[26] Perdikkas (see below); (b) an oracle which is said to be given to Perdikkas: 226 P-W (= L 51 Fontenrose) ἔcτι κράτοc βαcίλειον ἀγαυοῖc Τημενίδαιcι / γαίηc πλουτοφόροιο· δίδωcι γὰρ αἰγίοχοc Ζεύc. / ἀλλ' ἴθ' ἐπειγόμενοc Βοττηίδα πρὸc πολύμηλον· / ἔνθα δ' ἂν ἀργικέρωταc ἴδηιc χιονώδεαc αἶγαc / εὐνηθένταc ὕπνωι, κείνηc χθονὸc ἐν δαπέδοιcι / θῦε θεοῖc μακάρεccι καὶ ἄcτυ κτίζε πόληοc. Here the foundation of a city, which of course must be Aigai, is mentioned explicitly; from the sources of the oracle it is clear that this oracle does not concern a colonization from Argos to Macedonia, but was given to Perdikkas when he wanted to expand an already existing kingdom. Cf. D.S. 7, 16 ὅτι Περδίκκαc τὴν ἰδίαν βαcιλείαν αὐξῆcαι βουλόμενοc ἠρώτηcεν εἰc Δελφούc· ἡ δὲ ἔφη '...'; Eus. *Chron.* 1, 227, 18ff. (where Perdikkas wants to extend the territory which had first been occupied by Karanos; cf. Hammond-Griffith 10).

The relation of these oracles to each other is complicated and so is their dating. I shall discuss the matter only briefly and refer for detailed discussions to Momigliano 203-210; Parke-Wormell 1, 63f.; Jacoby in *FGrH* II B 400ff.; Fontenrose 374f.; Hammond-Griffith 7ff.

The oldest evidence of the Macedonian foundation-myths is the story in Hdt. 8, 137-138, in which no oracle is mentioned; yet it is possible that Herodotus had a goat-oracle in mind when he let Perdikkas tend the goats and sheep. Hammond-Griffith 7f. and 11 are quite confident that Herodotus knew of the oracle to Perdikkas, but left it out because he did not give the full story of Perdikkas' expansion. Parke-Wormell 1, 63f., however, believe that the version given in Herodotus preceded those with the oracles (regarding the Karanos-oracle as a fifth-century invention in order to support the genealogy of the Macedonian kings) and regard the Perdikkas-oracle as later than the

---

[24] Hammond-Griffith 10 suggest that perhaps this account was inspired by Euripides. But I cannot quite see why that should be so.

[25] Cf. Fontenrose 375: "... in a looser sense the goats are guides in this version too" (sc. in the verse oracle).

[26] On their relative positions in the genealogy cf. also Hammond-Griffith 12.

Karanos-oracle, mainly because it does not speak about *permanent* settlement in Aigai (in contrast to the Karanos-oracle). This suggests to them that it was created as an adaptation to the new situation after the move of the capital to Pella. But I do not think that the absence of the notion of permanence in the Perdikkas-oracle can prove that it was later.

The Karanos-oracle can be traced back to Theopompus (cf. Jacoby *FGrH* II B 401), but it cannot be decided whether it was known to Euripides or not[27]. Jacoby l.c., who states that the insertion of Karanos must in any case be dated about 400 B.C., thinks it possible that Euripides already knew Karanos as founder of the Macedonian dynasty and called him Archelaos to please the king (somewhat similarly Ridgeway 5 [whose identification of Karanos with the Gauanes of Herodotus' story, however, is purely hypothetical]; Geyer 99f., who suggests that Karanos had been inserted by Archelaos, perhaps in order to connect the Macedonian dynasty with northern Thessaly and gives references to older literature). The possibility of the insertion of Karanos preceding the *Archelaos* was rejected by Momigliano 207, who argued that (1) Karanos is not attested before Theopompus, (2) it would be difficult for Euripides to insert Archelaos when Karanos was already well established. But these arguments do not seem fatal (the first can certainly be discarded). Also Hammond-Griffith, who date the insertion of Karanos about 407-400 B.C. (5f.), taking over the argument of Parke-Wormell 1, 63f. that it must be dated before the move to Pella, let the *Archelaos* precede the insertion of Karanos and then embark on the rather fanciful hypothesis that Archelaos was inspired by Euripides' play "to seek a more impressive account of the origins of the Macedonian kingdom than that contained in the brilliant and only too memorable story told by Herodotus. Enlisting the aid of Delphi, he introduced Caranus as the founding father who came direct from Peloponnesian Argos to make a new home at Aegeae in Macedonia" (11).

In conclusion we can state only that the similarities between the myths of Karanos and Archelaos are such that one of them must be influenced by the other[28], whereas both seem to represent a more 'noble' version than the story in Herodotus (cf. Rosen 6, 9 and 14)[29].

---

[27] There are no traces of it in Hdt. 8, 139 and Th. 2, 100, 2; both of them know of only eight kings preceding Archelaos.

[28] In Paus. 9, 40, 8 λέγεται δὲ ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων Καρανὸν βασιλεύοντα ἐν Μακεδονίαι κρατῆcαι μάχηι Κιccέωc, ὃc ἐδυναcτεύεν ⟨ἐν⟩ χώραι τῆι ὁμόρωι it looks as if the name of the king is the result of close association of Karanos and Archelaos (cf. Momigliano 207). Fontenrose 374f. actually regards the oracles to Karanos and Archelaos as *one* oracle (L 50), against Parke-Wormell, who treat them as separate oracles (nrs. 225 and 227).

[29] A possible construction would be: (1) story of Perdikkas in Macedonian tradition, (2) Karanos, a Doric name meaning 'leader, ruler' (cf. Dascalakis 103;

2.2 *Dramatis personae*, chorus, scene

From test. 7 we can draw up a list of *dramatis personae*:

(1) Archelaos, who spoke the prologue (fr. 228 + fr. 2 A) and to whom several other fragments have been attributed (see comm. passim). Several of the fragments stress his noble descent and the necessity to exert himself (cf. fr. 231, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 242 + comm.);

(2) Kisseus, the treacherous king, who is addressed in fr. 229 (where see comm.); for other fragments attributed to him or considered to be addressed to him see comm. passim;

(3) 'friends of Kisseus'—or perhaps a representative of them?—, to whom also several of the fragments have been attributed; see comm. on test. 7, 6;

(4) slave of Kisseus, who came to warn Archelaos; Webster 256f. compared him with the slave in *Phrixos II* who warns Athamas that Phrixos must not be sacrified (Hyg. *fab.* 2; cf. Van Looy 166ff., who shows by comparing this version with the remains of the summary in *POxy.* 27, 2455 fr. 17 col. XIX-XX that Hyginus gives a summary of Euripides *Phrixos II*). An interesting point of difference, however, seems to be that the slave in the *Phrixos* is faithful to his own master and his son (as slaves usually are; cf. Brandt 20ff.), whereas the slave in the *Archelaos* protects Archelaos against his own master;

(5) Apollo as *deus ex machina*? (see comm. on test. 7, 13);

(6) there probably was a messenger-speech in which the story of the battle against the enemies was told, and perhaps a second messenger-speech to tell about the killing of Kisseus (but here we cannot be sure); on the habit of Euripides to incorporate sometimes more than one messenger-speech in his later plays (*Ph.* has even four) see Ludwig 11.

As to the identity of the chorus, it is generally accepted that they were Thracians, citizens of the town of Kisseus (so already Welcker 2, 702), and one may plausibly extend this assumption with the addition that they were probably *old* citizens; so Van Herwerden[2] 340, who infers this from fr. 262, 1 πάλαι (but see my comm. there); more substantial is the argument of Siegmann 5 n. 9, who says that they were probably old because they remained on stage during the battle (one may compare A. *Ag.* and *Pe.*). A female chorus could of course be defended on the same grounds (cf. E. *Ph.*) and cannot really be excluded. Yet, it seems less likely, as it is hard to see what status and function they could have in this play, whereas a chorus of worried

---

Hammond-Griffith 11 n. 2), which was better suited to the Greek claims of the Macedonians than the Macedonian Perdikkas (cf. also Dascalakis 102f. and 108), (3) Archelaos, this name being chosen by Euripides in order to please the king (cf. Jacoby's view mentioned above) and still felt to be not too shocking as a modification because of the similarity of meaning ('leader of the people').

old citizens seems to fit the dramatic situation very well. A drawback of the latter might be that they had to be present at least when Archelaos was planning to kill their own king; but see comm. on test. 7, 11 *arbitris semotis* (where I suggest that they went off-stage at this point). If the chorus does not go off-stage in this scene, their presence may be paralleled with the presence of the Corinthian women in *Med.* (which Grube 105 also regards as awkward).

We have no evidence that the daughter of Kisseus also played a part in the play (as has been sometimes suggested; cf. fr. 234 + comm.). Yet, if she did not, the *Archelaos* must have been a remarkably 'male' play, which would be very exceptional for Euripides (of the preserved plays only the satyr-play *Cyc.* contains no female characters). So perhaps she did. The summary in Hyginus, which does not mention her (except as a reward for Archelaos), cannot be used as evidence against her appearance in the play; cf. the summaries of *Ph.* (all of them conveniently printed by W. S. Barrett, CQ N.S. 15, 1965, 59 f.), which make no mention at all of Antigone: and yet she played a part in the play; Hyg. *fab.* 25, which, though based on *Med.* does not mention the episode with Aigeus, as was observed by Th. Kock, RhM 35, 1880, 270; and *hyp. Ba.*, which does not mention Teiresias.

The scene of the play was probably in front of the palace of Kisseus: here Archelaos could arrive from abroad and speak the prologue, and the chorus could come to complain about the war; see also comm. on test. 7, 7-9 *quo ... decideret.*

3. Papyri

Two papyri containing fragments of the *Archelaos* have been found:

3.1 *PHamb.* 118 a

Editions:

Ed. princeps by E. Siegmann in *Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* (eingel. von B. Snell), Hamburg 1954, 1-14 (plate 1).
C. Austin, *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta*, Berlin 1968, 13-14.
F. C. Görschen, Hermes 94, 1966, 306 (only col. III).
(All editions are based on personal inspection of the papyrus).

The papyrus, of which the provenance is unknown, is now in the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Hamburg (inv. nr. 639-640).

PHamb. 118 consists of two fragments, of which only fr. a contains remains of the *Archelaos*. For practical purposes however I shall also discuss the appearance and contents of fr. b[30]. Fr. a is 10,9 × 13,1 cms and contains the

[30] For the text of fr. b see the *ed. princeps*, Lloyd-Jones² 157 ff. and Görschen 297 ff.

remains of three columns; below col. II part of the lower margin is preserved (maximum width 1,5 cms); the intercolumnar space varies from 0,5 to 1,5 cms. Fr. b is 3,8 × 7,2 cms and contains the remains of two columns of text; the intercolumnar space varies from 0,0 to 1,5 cms; on the back of fr. b a join is visible. In both fragments the interlinear space varies from 2 to 3 mms, except for the bottom of fr. a col. I, where it is wider (see the app.). Cf. also the description in Siegmann 1. Both fragments are written across the fibres on the back of a juridical text (*PHamb.* 168, edited in the same volume on pp. 133-138 by H. Vocke), which its editor dated about the middle of III B.C. or earlier.

The handwriting shows the characteristics of the documentary hands of III B.C. (Siegmann dated it III/II B.C.), cf. especially the shapes of κ, ν, ο, τ and ω. Examples and descriptions of similar hands can be found in W. Schubart, *Griechische Palaeographie*, München 1925, 23 ff. (Siegmann 1 refers esp. to Schubart's figs. 1, 5, 6, 7, 9 and to *PHib.* 1, 99 [plate X]. a receipt for rent dated 270 [269] B.C.). Apart from the handwriting no other dating-criteria seem to be available.

There are no lectional signs or corrections. Twice in fr. a the scribe seems to have made a mistake (col. II 10 and 15). Scriptio plena is found in col. II 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 24; elision is effected in col. II 7, 15, 17, 21. ι-adscript is written.

In the margin before col. II 23 and col. III 12 there seems to be a little oblique stroke (see the app.). In col. II 23 this coincides with the beginning of a speech, and in col. III 12 it *might* coincide with the end of the same speech. But (a) we cannot be certain that these oblique strokes were used to mark off sections like this (oblique strokes in the left margin are occasionally found, but no firm conclusion can be drawn as to their purpose; sometimes they may be interpreted as indications of a new section, but elsewhere they have been interpreted differently or not at all, cf. Turner[7], plate 12 + comm.; to his examples may be added *TrGF* 2, F 626, 42; 646, 25; 669, 10 [and in middle of line: 682, 14 and 18; 701, 8]; cf. Kannicht-Snell on 626, 41-44. Perhaps it is relevant to compare also *PPar.* 2 recto [Chrys., first half II B.C.] = Roberts 6 a, where a curled oblique is used to indicate poetic quotations), (b) this would imply an unusually long speech within a prologue-rhesis (i.e. a speech of 29 lines, if the column-height is 37 lines — see below —; other speeches in prologue-rheseis are much shorter, cf. *Heracl.* 29-30, *Ion* 29-36, *IT* 17-24, *Ph.* 17-20; one might argue that in the *Archelaos* the oracle was of special importance, but still 29 lines seem to me rather out of proportion). It is also conceivable that in col. III 12 the oblique stroke marked the beginning of a new prologue (with a column-height of 37 lines the length of the prologue-rhesis of the *Archelaos* would then be 62 lines). No decision seems possible.

As to the identification of the papyrus, it was seen by Siegmann 2 that *PHamb.* 118 contained remains of the *Archelaos* of Euripides: the long

genealogy in fr. a col. II, which ends with the announcement of the birth of *Archelaos*, is very unlikely to have occurred in any other play. Besides, as Siegmann noted, the metre of the fragment can be regarded as typical of the later plays of Euripides (also the *caesura media* with elision in fr. a col. II 24 points to Euripides as the author; cf. Maas 66 f.). As to the position of the genealogy in the play, Siegmann 6 added "da aber bezeugt ist, dass das Stück mit fr. 228 N² begann, ist es sicher, dass die Genealogie im Prolog stand" (fr. 228 containing the beginning of the same genealogy).

This idea has been confirmed by the identification of other parts of the same papyrus, which proved to be from Euripidean prologues as well: fr. a col. I 1-13 (14) = *IT* 53-65 (66) (Barrett apud Austin 13); fr. b col. I = *Hec.* 28-44 (Barrett apud Lloyd-Jones² 160); also it has been argued convincingly that fr. b col. II is part of the prologue of the *Hypsipyle* (Lloyd-Jones² 157-160). As to fr. a col. III we cannot be certain whether all this is still part of the prologue of the *Archelaos* (see above), but it is quite possible that it is (if so, a column-height of 37 lines would lead to a prologue-rhesis of at least 64 lines, which is not at all unusual). Görschen 306 f. regarded fr. a col. III as part of the prologue of the *Ixion*, but this was based on a false reading of col. III 7. So the papyrus is clearly from a collection of Euripidean prologue-speeches, a possibility which was also mentioned by Siegmann 15 (intr. to *PHamb.* 119).

These new identifications imply that the numbering of the *editio princeps* must be changed: Siegmann counted 65 lines of the prologue of the *Archelaos*, suggesting that with a column-height of 25 lines col. I 1-8 could contain fr. 228 and col. I 9-25 + col. II 1-4 the story of the Danaïds, i.e. at least 20 lines about the Danaïds, which Siegmann himself already admitted to be "ausserordentlich ausführlich" (p. 6).

Now that fr. a col. I 1-14 must be yielded to *IT* 53-66, the *Archelaos* cannot have started earlier than fr. a col. I 15. At first sight Barrett's idea that this line ended with πατ]ῃρ, thus overlapping with fr. 228 (Barrett apud Austin 13) is quite attractive. But (a) the traces in the papyrus are very difficult to interpret (see app.) and neither]ῃρ nor]ῃι can be ruled out or verified from the papyrus (though]ῃι seems less likely), (b) the interlinear space between the last lines of this column is wider than usual (see app.) and this *might* indicate that the scribe was reluctant to start a new prologue at the bottom of the column. If so, col. I 15 must have something to do with the prologue of *IT*: perhaps an extra line or a colophon (for the habit of placing these at the end of a section, cf. Schubart 98 ff. [examples in note on p. 182 f.]), e.g. Εὐριπίδου Ἰφιγένεια ἐν τοῖϲ Ταύρ]ọịϲ. I think we may therefore reckon with the possibility, that the prologue of the *Archelaos* started at the top of the next column. This would imply that the column-height was either 25 + 8 (= fr. 228) + x (= some lines about the Danaïds), i.e. at least 33 lines, or 25 + 3

(= fr. 846) + x (introduction of Danaos and story of the Danaïds), i.e. at least 28 lines[31].

A further indication of the column-height is now provided by fr. b: col. I contains *Hec.* 28-44 and col. II 17 lines of the prologue of the *Hypsipyle*. Between them there must be room for (a) *Hec.* 45-58 + (b) fr. 752, which is the beginning of *Hyps.* Διόνυcoc, ὃc θύρcoιcι καὶ νεβρῶν δοραῖc / καθαπτὸc ἐν πεύκηιcι Παρναcὸν κάτα/πηδᾶι χορεύων παρθένοιc cὺν Δελφίcιν + (c) a transition between fr. 752 and *PHamb.* b col. II, which mentions the sons of Ariadne and Dionysos (one of whom, Thoas, was the father of Hypsipyle). Görschen 298 + n. 1 suggests that one line was lost in between: "Vielleicht in Gestalt eines genealogischen Verses wie γήμαc τέκοc Μίνωοc ἐκφύει πατὴρ, aber der Hinweis auf Ariadnes Mutterschaft könnte notfalls auch zu Beginn des Pap. Hamb. 118 b II eingefügt worden sein, etwa durch Cτάφ[υλόν τε φύcαc πρῶτον ἐκ Μινωΐδοc". Both supplements seem to me very odd, immediately after the lines about Dionysos' dancing on Parnassos! I would expect the lost part to contain something like "once came to Naxos and married Ariadne, the daughter of Minos ...". For this two or three lines could provide room (though, of course, it is impossible to guess how elaborate or concise Euripides may have been)[32]. If we add this up, the result is that 14+3+ca. 3 = ca. 20 lines were lost between col. I and II, which leads to a column-height of ca. 37 lines (on this height cf. intr. *Kresphontes* 3.1), or perhaps it is more cautious to say: of at least 34 lines.

Although this column-height may seem to favour the insertion of fr. 228 in fr. a col. II, I would be hesitant to use it as an argument, where so much is still uncertain.

The identification of fr. b excludes immediate connection with fr. a (which was considered by Siegmann 1 f.).

To the collection of prologues of which *PHamb.* 118 was part *PHamb.* 119 (edited on p. 14-19 of the same volume by E. Siegmann) also probably belonged. Siegmann 14, who noticed the palaeographical similarities between *PHamb.* 118 and 119 (there can be no doubt, I think, that both are by the same hand), was reluctant to attribute both to the same roll, because (a) *PHamb.* 119 is of coarser material, (b) in *PHamb.* 119 the text is only on the recto, (c) the width of columns and lower margin is different (*PHamb.* 119: 7,8 cms between the beginnings of col. II and III; lower margin 2,3-2,5 cms), but admitted: "Für alles dies liesse sich eine Erklärung finden, wenn die

---

[31] If the *Archelaos* started at the bottom of col. I, one line has to be subtracted from these numbers.

[32] The next fragment of the *Hypsipyle*-prologue (fr. 61) could come almost immediately after *PHamb.* 118 b col. II. This implies that before fr. 61, 1 there were ca. 23 lines of prologue—a number which fits in nicely with Bond's calculations (cf. Bond 9 f. and on fr. 61).

Zusammengehörigkeit inhaltlich evident wäre". Now *PHamb.* 119 also seems to contain parts of Euripidean prologues; cf. Austin 84f., who regards col. III as part of the prologue of the *Alkmene* (following Siegmann 15) and col. II as the end of another prologue; Mette[2] 64 n. 2, id.[3] 128 and id.[5] 135, who suggested for col. II the prologue of the *Thyestes*, an idea which was accepted by Webster 114f. So I think that both papyri can now be safely regarded as belonging together (cf. also Austin 13 "Pap. Hamb. 119 [eiusdem pap.] ..."). The difference in material could easily be explained: the roll may have consisted of several pieces of papyrus stuck together (cf. Schubart 163 + note on p. 189); as to the difference in size: the different widths of the lower margin may be due to the fact that papyrus has been broken away; the different width of columns could e.g. be caused by the desire to get a certain amount of text on the roll: if the scribe saw himself running out of writing-material, he might narrow the columns in order to save room, or, alternatively, if he proved to have room enough, he may have widened the columns. On the other hand, as the difference is not very big, it may also be accidental.

It is obvious that the collection was not in alphabetical order, so that it is possible that the selection was made according to some other criterion. But I cannot see what this criterion could have been (Görschen' speculations [306f.] are very unconvincing). Collections of extracts from works of literature like our papyrus were not uncommon: cf. e.g. the so-called 'Tragödienlieder-papyrus' (*PStrassb.* inv. WG 304-307; cf. Snell[1] 69ff.); *PBerol.* 9771 (*BKT* 5, 17, 2, containing lyrics from *Phaethon* preceded by the lemma εμφαε[θοντι); *POsl.* inv. 1413, cf. S. Eitrem - L. Amundsen, Symbolae Osloenses 31, 1955, 25-29, who suggest that collections like this could be the textbook of a Dionysiac artist who recited only parts of tragedies (lyric as well as iambic, cf. p. 27) and give further literature and evidence for this kind of artists and performances. Cf. also W. E. H. Cockle, in *Proceedings of the XIVth Intern. Congr. of Papyrology*, London 1975, 59-65. Of course we have no means of telling whether our collection served the same purpose, but it is possible that it did. For collections of non-tragic texts cf. *POxy.* 13, 1621 (speeches from Thucydides, IV A.D.) and Suet. *Dom.* 10, 3 *quod ... contiones ... regum ac ducum ex Tito Liuio circumferret* (sc. Mettius Pompusianus). For the habit of reciting tragic rheseis in the time of Theophrastus cf. also Pickard-Cambridge 276 + n. 6.

3.2 *POxy.* 3, 419

Editions:

Ed. princeps by B. P. Grenfell - A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3, London 1903, 65-66.

H. von Arnim, *Supplementum Euripideum*, Bonn 1913, 80 (no indications as to whether this edition was based on the original or not).

C. Austin, *Nova fragmenta Euripidea* ..., Berlin 1968, 17-18 (based on *ed. princeps*).
Cf. also on this papyrus:
F. Blass, APF 3, 1906, 277.
A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, in J. U. Powell, *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Third series*, Oxford 1933, 147.
Donovan 74 f.

The papyrus, which was in Louvain, was destroyed during the first world war; cf. R. A. Coles, *Location-list of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London 1974, 14 ("destroyed?"); Donovan 74 n. 1: "M. Jean Bingen reports that this fragment has been destroyed, and that no photograph is available".

The fragment was described by Grenfell and Hunt as "a narrow strip [sc. 9,2 × 4,6 cms] containing parts of sixteen lines from the *Archelaus* of Euripides, written in round rather irregular uncials of medium size, which are of the second or third century ... Several corrections have been made in the text, perhaps by the original hand, to which also the stops and occasional accents, etc., may be due". Elision seems to have been effected (4 ×); once also indicated by a diastole. Cf. also Donovan 73 f. The papyrus was identified by Blass (apud Grenfell and Hunt) as containing part of the *Archelaos*, because of the coincidence of ll. 8-9 with fr. 245. It contains the remains of (probably) 12 trochaic tetrameters, followed by remains of a lyrical passage.

TEXT

test. 1

ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰc Μακεδονίαν παρὰ Ἀρχέλαον γενόμενος (sc. Euripides) διέτριψε καὶ χαριζόμενος αὐτῶι δρᾶμα ὁμωνύμως ἔγραψε.

test. 2

tristitia ... tragoediae proprium; ideoque Euripides petente Archelao rege ut de se tragoediam scriberet abnuit ac precatus est ne accideret Archelao aliquid tragoediae proprium, ostendens nihil aliud esse tragoediam quam miseriarum conprehensionem.

*test. 3

ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺc μὲν ἔγκειται ὁ Κλείτων, πολὺc δὲ ὁ Ἀρχέλαος, ἑκάστοτε φροντίζειν ἀεί τι καί ποιεῖν τῶν εἰωθότων ἀναγκάζοντες, ὥcτ' ἔμοιγε μιcθὸν οὐκ ἀηδῆ μὲν οὖν, οὐ δὲ ἄπονον δοκεῖ Ἀρχέλαος ἀναπράccεcθαι τῶν τε δωρεῶν, ὧν ἔδωκέ μοι εὐθέως ἀφικομένωι καὶ ὅτι εἰcτία με λαμπρότερον ἢ ἐμοὶ φίλον ἑκάστης ἡμέρας.

test. 4

(ca. a. 276-219 histrio ignotus [...] vicit)
Ἡραῖα
Ἡρακλεῖ Εὐριπίδου
Ἀρχελάωι Εὐριπίδου
Νάϊα ἐν Δωδώνηι
Ἀρχελάωι Εὐριπίδου

test. 1 *Vit. Eur.* 2 (1, 2, 8-9 Schwartz) ‖ **1** μακεδόνα *V* | περὶ *V Q C*
test. 2 Diomedes *Art. Gramm.* 3 (1, 488, 20 ff. Keil) ‖ **1** *ideoque edd. ueteres: ideo quod A B M* ‖ **2** *scriberit A B M* | *abnuet A M* ‖ **3** *accederet A B M* | *proprium edd. ueteres,* om. *A B M*, *aptum codex Parisinus 7538* apud Gaisfordium
***test. 3** [E.] *ep.* 5, 12 ff. Gösswein ‖ **2** ἀεί del. Hercher ‖ **4** οὐ δὲ interpungit Gösswein: ⟨ἀλλ'⟩οὐδὲ temptat Hercher ‖ **5** εὐθὺc Barnes ‖ **6** ἑcτιᾶι Lubinus | φίλον *β*, *57.45*, *3021*: φίλον ἢ (ἤ *L*) *a*, φίλον ἦν *ed. Aldina*
test. 4 *TrGF* 1 DID. B 11, 8-12 (= *IG* V 2, 118) | Tegea; III a. Chr. n. ‖ **1** sc. Argiva

test. 5

παρέξω τι δρᾶμα ὡϲ ἀληθῶϲ. ἔχω λόγον ἐπιτήδειον εἰπεῖν ἐμαυτῶι, δρᾶμα Ἀττικόν, δρᾶμα Μακεδονικόν, οὐκ Ἀρχέλαον Εὐριπίδου, ἀλλὰ Φίλιππον Δημοϲθένουϲ.

test. 6

Ἀρχέλαοϲ

test. 7

(1) Archelaus Temeni filius exsul a fratribus eiectus in Thraciam ad regem Cisseum uenit, qui cum a finitimis oppugnaretur Archelao regnum et filiam in coniugium dare pollicetur si se ab hoste tutatus esset Archelaus, quia ab Hercule esset oriundus, nam Temenus Herculis filius fuit. (2) qui hostes uno proelio fugauit et ab rege pollicita petit. ille ab amicis dissuasus fidem fraudauit eumque per dolum interficere uoluit. (3) itaque foueam iussit fieri et multos carbones eo ingeri et incendi et super uirgulta tenuia poni, quo cum Archelaus uenisset ut decideret. (4) hoc regis seruus Archelao patefecit; qui re cognita dicit se cum rege colloqui uelle secreto; arbitris semotis Archelaus regem arreptum in foueam coniecit atque ita eum perdidit. (5) inde profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce, oppidumque ex nomine caprae Aegeas constituit. ab hoc Alexander Magnus oriundus esse dicitur.

test. 8

Cύ, ἔφη (sc. Alexander), κελεύειϲ ἐμὲ διφθέραν λαβεῖν τὸν ἀφ' Ἡρακλέουϲ γεγονότα καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡγεμόνα καὶ Μακεδόνων βαϲιλέα; Πάνυ γε, εἶπεν (sc. Diogenes), ὥϲπερ ὁ πρόγονόϲ ϲου .71 Ποῖοϲ, ἔφη, πρόγονοϲ; Ἀρχέλαοϲ. ἢ

test. 5 Libanius *Decl.* 23, 70 (6, 420, 1 ff. Foerster) || **1** τί *H Va B Par Ma P* Morellus | δρᾶμα, δρᾶμα ὡϲ Reiske
test. 6 *IG* XIV 1152, 2 (a sinistra) | Roma; index Euripidis fabularum
test. 7 Hyg. *fab.* 219 (Rose) || **1** *Temeni* Muncker: *Timeni F* | *Thraciam* Robert[2] 2, 669 n. 4: *Macedoniam F, Mygdoniam*? M. Schmidt || **4** *quia* — **5** *fuit* del. Nauck || **5** *Temenus* Muncker: *Timenus F* || **13** *in Macedoniam* del. Bothe 77 f.
test. 8 Dio Chrys. 4, 70-72 (1, 67, 19 ff. Von Arnim) || **1** ϲὺ δὲ *U B* | κελεύειϲ με *U B V* || **4** ὁ om. *B P* ||

οὐκ αἰπόλος ἦν ὁ Ἀρχέλαος οὐδὲ ἦλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν αἶγας ἐλαύνων; πότερον οὖν αὐτὸν ἐν πορφύραι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν διφθέραι οἴει τοῦτο ποιεῖν; καὶ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀνείθη τε καὶ ἐγέλασε καὶ ἔφη, Τὰ περὶ τὸν χρησμόν, ὦ Διόγενες, λέγεις. 72 ὁ δὲ στρυφνῶι τῶι προσώπωι, Ποῖον, εἶπε, χρησμόν; οὐκ οἶδα ἔγωγε, πλὴν ὅτι αἰπόλος ἦν ὁ Ἀρχέλαος. ἀλλ' ἂν ἀπαλλαγῇς τοῦ τύφου καὶ τῶν νῦν πραγμάτων, ἔσῃ βασιλεύς, οὐ λόγωι τυχόν, ἀλλ' ἔργωι.

*test. 9

οὐδ' Εὐριπίδου κατηγορῶ τῶι μὲν Ἀρχελάωι περιτεθεικότος τὰς Τημένου πράξεις, τὸν δὲ Τειρεσίαν βεβιωκότα παρεισάγοντος πέντε γενεῶν πλέον.

8 αὐτὸν om. *U B V* || **9** οἴει om. *P* || **10** ἐγέλασεν *V B* || **13** ὅτι om. *U B* || **14** ὁ om. *U B V* || **15** τυχὼν *V* | ἀλλὰ *U B*
***test. 9** Agatharchides in Phot. *Bibl.* 444 b 29 ff. (7, 144, 4 ff. Henry)

fr. 228 = 1 A

ΑΡΧ.? Δαναὸς ὁ πεντήκοντα θυγατέρων πατὴρ
Νείλου λιπὼν κάλλιστον †ἐκ γαίηϲ† ὕδωρ,
ὃϲ ἐκ μελαμβρότοιο πληροῦται ῥοὰϲ
Αἰθιοπίδοϲ γῆϲ, ἡνίκ' ἂν τακῆι χιὼν
τέθριππ' ἄγοντοϲ ἡλίου κατ' αἰθέρα,

fr. 228 1-6 Tiberius *ΠΕΡΙ...CΧΗΜΑΤΩΝ* 48 (44, 12 Ballaira) ἐνταῦθα (Hdt. 1, 6, 1) παρεμβέβληται τὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ. καὶ Εὐριπίδηϲ '...' οἱ γὰρ τρεῖϲ περὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ϲτίχοι περιττοί || **1-5** Anon. *ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗC ΤΟΥ ΝΕΙΛΟΥ ΑΝΑΒΑCΕΩC* 2 (C. Landi, SIFC 3, 1895, 538, 23 = *FGrH* 647 F 1, 2 [200, 7]) Εὐριπίδηϲ δὲ καὶ τὸν τόπον ἀφορίζει, λέγων οὕτωϲ ἐν δράματι Ἀρχελάωι (ἐν ... Ἀρχελάωι om. *C*) '...' | Tzetzes in *Il.* 1, 427 (A. Lolos, *Der unbekannte Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Johannes Tzetzes*, [Beitr. z. kl. Phil. 130] Königstein/Ts. 1981, 119f.) Ἀναξαγόραϲ πάλιν δὲ μετὰ τοῦ Δημοκρίτου καί τιϲ ἀνὴρ Ἀρχέλαοϲ ὁμοῦ καὶ Καλλιϲθένηϲ Αἰϲχύλοϲ Εὐριπίδηϲ τε ϲυντρέχουϲιν Ὁμήρωι ... (120, 13) ὁ δ'Εὐριπίδηϲ λέγει '...' || **1+6-8** Strabo 5, 2 4 p. 221 C (Aly) καὶ τὴν Πελοπόννηϲον δὲ Πελαϲγίαν φηϲὶν Ἔφοροϲ κληθῆναι, καὶ Εὐριπίδηϲ δ'ἐν Ἀρχελάωι φηϲίν, ὅτι '...' || **1** Plu. *De amore prolis* 4, 497 a (3, 266, 2 Paton-Pohlenz-Sieveking) '...' εἰ δ'ἄτεκνοϲ ἦν, πλείοναϲ ἂν εἶχε κληρονομοῦνταϲ, καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίουϲ | [Plu.] *X Orat. Vitae* 837 e (V 2, 1, 14, 23 Mau) ἐτελεύτα (sc. Isocrates) ... προειπὼν τρεῖϲ ἀρχὰϲ δραμάτων Εὐριπίδου '...' (seq. *IT* 1, fr. 819, 1) | *Vita Isocr.* 3, 148 (p. 258 Westermann) προαναγνοὺϲ δὲ τούτουϲ τοὺϲ ϲτίχουϲ ἐτελεύτηϲεν (sc. Isocrates) ἐκ γ' δραμάτων Εὐριπίδου '...' (seq. fr. 819, 1, *IT* 1) | Iuba apud Rufinum *Comm. in metra Terent.* 24 (6, 561, 14 Keil) *Iuba in libro quarto sic dicit, 'iamborum itaque exempla, quae maxime frequentata sunt, subdidi... '...''* || **2-4** D.S. 1, 38, 4 (1, 65, 21 Vogel) Ἀναξαγόραϲ δ'ὁ φυϲικὸϲ ἀπεφήνατο τῆϲ ἀναβάϲεωϲ αἰτίαν εἶναι τὴν τηκομένην χιόνα κατὰ τὴν Αἰθιοπίαν, ὧι καὶ ὁ ποιητὴϲ Εὐριπίδηϲ μαθητὴϲ ὢν ἠκολούθηκε· λέγει γοῦν '...' || **4** Steph. Byz. s.v. Αἰθίοψ (1, 47, 14 Meineke) καὶ Αἰθιοπίϲ ὁ αὐτὸϲ (sc. Euripides) ἐν Ἀρχελάωι '...' || **7-8** Strabo 8, 6, 9

fr. 228 1 om. Anon. *C* || **2** Νείλου: -ον A. Meineke, *Athenaei Deipnosophistae* 4, Lipsiae 1867, 36 | ἐκ γαίηϲ D.S. *C D*: ἐκ γαίαϲ D.S., Anon., Tzetzes, εὐκταίηϲ Tib., ἐν γύαιϲ J. Luzac apud Valckenaer 30, εὐγλαγοῦϲ G. Burges, *Aeschyli, quae supersunt, Fabulae et Fragmenta. Supplices*, Londini 1821, 59, ἐκχέανθ' Meineke, ἧϲ γαίαϲ Nauck, ἑπτάρρου ϲτόμα S. Mekler, *Euripidea. Textkritische Studien*, Wien 1879, 62, εὐαγοῦϲ H. van Herwerden, Mnem. N.S. 22, 1894, 233, εὐϲταλὴϲ Van Herwerden[1] 39, εὐαγὴϲ Th. Kock, *Veri Similia*, Lipsiae 1872-73, 235, ἐκ χρείαϲ Munro 235, F. W. Schmidt 2, 453, ἐκ πάντων Blaydes 112 (inter alia), εὐκταίωϲ Hartung 2, 558, G. Ballaira, A & R 14, 1969, 63-65, ἓν γαίαϲ West 71 || **3** μελαμβρότοιο: -βώλοιο Burges | ῥοὰϲ: ῥοᾶϲ Tzetzes, θέρει Anon. *C*, ῥοαῖϲ Valckenaer 30 || **4** Αἰθιοπίδοϲ: αἰθιόπιδοϲ Anon. | ἡνίκ'ἂν: ἡνίκα Tib., Steph. Byz. | τακῆι: τακείη Tib. || **5** τέθριππ' ἄγοντοϲ F. W. Schmidt 2, 454: τεθριππεύοντοϲ Tib., τεθρίππου ὄντοϲ Anon. *F*, τέθριππ' ἰόντοϲ Tzetzes (def. M. Papathomopoulos, *Nouveaux fragments d'auteurs anciens* [*Σειρὰ 'Πέλεια'* 5], Joannina 1980, 39f.; contra: J. Diggle, CR 32, 1982, 90; G. L. Koniaris, AJPh 103, 1982, 113f.), τέθριππ' ὀχοῦντοϲ Grotius[2] 375, τέθριππ' ἔχοντοϲ L. Doederlein, *Spec. Nov. Ed. Soph.* 40 (teste Nauck), τέθριππ' ἀνέντοϲ Musgrave 3, 550, τέθριππ' ἐλῶντοϲ F. Jacobs, *Animadversiones in Euripidis tragoedias*, Gothae/Amstelodami 1790, 130 (etiam Burges 59; Cobet[2] 255 [= id.[3] 215]), fort. τέθριπφ' ἱέντοϲ Papathomopoulos, τέρθριον ἰόντοϲ West 71 et apud Papathomopoulos (contra: J. Diggle, CR 32, 1982, 90) | κατ' αἰθέρα: κατὰ χθόνα Anon. *C* ||

ἐλθὼν ἐϲ Ἄργοϲ ᾤικιϲ' Ἰνάχου πόλιν·
Πελαϲγιώταϲ δ' ὠνομαϲμένουϲ τὸ πρὶν
Δαναοὺϲ καλεῖϲθαι νόμον ἔθηκ' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα

p. 371 C (Aly) τὴν δὲ ἀκρόπολιν τῶν Ἀργείων οἰκίϲαι λέγεται Δαναόϲ, ὃϲ τοϲοῦτον τοὺϲ πρὸ αὐτοῦ δυναϲτεύονταϲ ἐν τοῖϲ τόποιϲ ὑπερβαλέϲθαι δοκεῖ, ὥϲτε κατ' Εὐριπίδην '...' || **2-5** fortasse respiciunt Theophyl. Simoc. *Hist.* 7, 17, 11; Sen. *NQ* 4, 2, 17; Joh. Lyd. *De Mens.* 4, 107

6 ἐϲ Kramer: εἰϲ Strabo, κατ' Tib. | ᾤκιϲ' Scaliger (teste Grotio² 956): ᾤκηϲεν Tib., Strabo || **7** δ' om. Strabo 8, 6, 9 p. 371 C || **8** ἔθηκ' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα: ἔθηκεν ἑλλάδα Strabo 5, 2, 4 p. 221 C (ubi ex 8, 9, 6 p. 371 C Corais)

PHamb. 118 a

col. I

. .
]. ν̣ο̣ν̣
]. ο̣. . . . . .
]λ̣ω̣. ο̣δ̣.
]η̣ν̣ε̣. .
]ϲ̣εν. .
]β̣. . . . . μ̣α̣ι̣
]χω
]. . ν̣. γω
]ο̣αϲ
]μ̣εθαν̣
]αξ
]α̣.
]. . ν
]
]. .
. .

col. I 12-13 interlinear space here is 4 mms instead of the average 2-3 mms || **13-15** there seems to be room for only one line in between, not two as Siegmann thought (I am indebted for this observation to W. S. Barrett) || **15**]. . at the edge of the papyrus a blotted trace, which could be a small rounded letter (or part of another letter if ink has broken away); then a long descender seems certain; near its top there are two tiny hor., joining a second, thinner vert., which descends until a little below the lower hor.; all this would either fit ρ (ignoring the bottom part of the second vert.), or ι. (ignoring the two hor. traces); I do not think there is more ink in the line:]. . Siegmann,]η̣ρ? Barrett apud Austin 13, perhaps]ο̣η Maehler (in a letter to W. S. Barrett of 16 December 1974), who found this "slightly more convincing than]ο̣ν" (drawbacks of this reading are: [1] the long descender, [2] the letters would then be *very* small, even for the end of a line; cf. col. II 6 π̣. . η̣ρ: small, but not as small as]ο̣η would be)

col. II

.......]...........[.....].......[
.....]..[.....].......[..]..[.......]..[
......].[..].περμ.[.]......[....].....[
........ου.εψαυcελυγκεωc......
α.αcεγενετοτουδεδιπτυχονγενο[
π..ιτοcμανε[.]cωνθυγατερωντριωνπ..ηρ
οcτεγκα...ε.χαλκεωινυμ.ευματ[

col. II 1]........... specks of ink at top and bottom of line; then hor. trace joined to vert. at right end, too high for η, π compatible; then a blot (perh. ο or ρ or left end of τ, but there seems to be more ink above it); vert. trace (could form τ with preceding trace); specks of ink on displaced papyrus; after the gap indefinite traces (some of them vertical) || **2**]..[indefinite specks of ink | after the first gap blotted trace; then ο possible: ο Siegmann; after this indefinite traces (also between the square brackets there is occasional ink, but the fibres are distorted and I cannot see what belongs to which line) || **3**].[speck of ink at top of gap |]. curved trace, which could be top + left part of rounded letter (ο or c; perh. some ink of bottom is left too, but this is very uncertain) or right part of fork of υ; after μ beginning of oblique?? | after second gap blot (could be e.g. ο or other rounded letter or left end of τ); vert. (could form τ with preceding blot or be a letter on its own or be connected to the following traces); two vert. traces, the first very thin, the second joined by part of crossbar at top from the left; then indefinite traces; neither room nor traces favour]τρα...[:].τ....[Siegmann |].....[two vert. with hor. in between at medium height (slightly sloping to the right), which seems to be crossed by a third vert. in its middle; then some rounded traces (ω or .ο perh. possible); then ν[would fit:]....ν[Siegmann || **4** .. at beginning of line thin vert. trace at bottom and specks of ink to the left of it; then perh. beginning of triangular letter: .[.] Siegmann | then upright with hor. joining its top from the right and a little blot to the left of top (μ or λ? cf. 6 μανειcων or 25 καλειν; or it may be part of the preceding letter); specks of ink; vert., slightly sloping to the right; two vert. traces (some indefinite ink in between); oblique trace, pointing to the left, with some hor. ink above, joining the preceding vert. at its top (γα? cf. 6 θυγατερων); vert., perh. thickening at top, ρ might fit | ου. : ουκ Siegmann | after λυγκεωc two vert.: "π..[, γ, μ od. ähnl., kaum δ..[" Siegmann | then triangular letter possible; then specks of ink, πατροc compatible: πατ[ρ]οc regarded as possible by Siegmann || **5** α.α: α[.]α Siegmann || **6** τριccων Siegmann, who rejected τριων or τριγονων || **7** οcτ: or αcτ Siegmann, but space and traces suggest οcτ | εγκα...ε. of α loop is visible, so λ excluded; after α upright, bending to the right at top, τ would fit nicely, but ρ or υ are also conceivable; then a long upright, leaning backwards and some indefinite ink to the right, η compatible (cf. 15 αλ.ηνηc) or κ; then a vert. with some ink to the right of its top, ρ or γ possible; after ε bottom of vert., slightly sloping to the left, ν or ι would fit; εγκατηγεν seems to fit traces and space best: εγκαλυπτει (but hardly room for λ) or εγκατηγεν (but hardly ν at end) Siegmann, εγκαλυπτει Austin | νυμ.ευματ[seems to fit exactly, although the traces are scanty: νυμ or αυμ Siegmann ||

fr. 2 A

(col. II)

(ΑΡΧ.) . . . . . .] . [. .].π̣ε̣ρμ . [.] . . . . . . [. . . .] . . . . . [
. . . . οὐκ ἔψαυσε, Λυγκέως . . . . . .
Ἄβας ἐγένετο· τοῦ δὲ δίπτυχον γένο[ς·
Προῖτος μανε[ι]σῶν θυγατέρων τρ̣ι̣ῶ̣ν̣ πατήρ,
ὅς τ' ἐ̣γ̣κ̣α̣τ̣ῆ̣γ̣ε̣ν̣ χαλκέωι νυμφεύματ[ι

(col. II) 3]Ὑπ̣ε̣ρ̣μ̣ή̣[σ]τ̣ρ̣α̣ e.g. Siegmann ||**4** init. fort. ν̣ύ̣μ̣φ̣η̣ γ̣ὰ̣ρ̣ vel γ̣ά̣μ̣ω̣ν̣ γ̣ὰ̣ρ̣: αὐτῆς γὰρ e.g. Siegmann | fin. πατ[ρ]ὸς vel γὰρ οὖν vel μὲν οὖν vel μόνου / μονῇ e.g. Siegmann (δ' ἀπὸ vel δὲ παῖς non probant Siegmann et Austin), γόνος vel τέκος Snell in margine ||**6** τρισσῶν Siegmann ||**7** vel ἐγκαλύπτει Siegmann ||

δαναα̣.......ε......ακριcιοcπο̣τε̣
δαναη̣c̣δε̣περc̣ευc.γεν̣ε̣τ̣οε̣κχρυcο̣ρρυτων
cταν̣ω̣νωνοcελθ̣ω̣ν̣γ..γονοcκαρατομοc
αιθ̣ιοπαεγημ̣ε̣ν̣ανδρ̣ο̣μ̣εδαντη̣ν̣κηφεω̣c
η̣τριπτυχουc̣ε̣γε̣ι̣νατοεκπερcεωcκορουc
α̣λ̣κ̣αιονη̣δ̣ε̣c̣..νελ̣ονοcτε̣αρ̣γουc̣πολιν
.[.]χ̣ε̣.μ̣υ̣κ̣η̣ναcπ̣ατε̣ρ̣α̣δ̣εαλκμη̣νηcτ̣..τ.ν̣
.λ̣εκτρ̣υ̣ωναζ[.]υc̣δ̣εcαλ̣.η̣νηcλεχοc
π̣.[.]ω̣ντοκ̣λε̣ιν̣[.]..ρ̣ακλ̣ε̣ουccπ̣ειρειδεμαc
υ̣λ̣λ̣οcδετουδ̣[.]τημ̣ε̣νοcδυ̣λλουπατροc
ο̣cα̣.γοcωικηcε̣ηρ̣α̣κ̣λ̣ε̣ο̣υ̣cγε̣γωcαπ̣ο̣
απ̣α̣ιδ̣ι̣α̣ι̣δεχρω̣μ̣ε̣νοcπατηρ̣ε̣μοc̣
τημ̣ενοcεcαγν̣.cηλθ̣εδωδ̣ων̣ηcπ̣τυχαc
τεκν̣.νερω̣τ̣ιτηcδομω̣ν̣υμ̣ουδιοc
προ̣πο̣λ̣[.]cδιωνη̣cειπετημενωιταδ̣ε
ʹωπαιπ̣εφυκωcεκγονωνηρακ̣λ̣εουc
ζευcc[..]δ̣ιδωcιπαιδαεγω̣μ̣α̣ν̣τευομ̣α̣ι̣
οναρχ[..]α̣ονχρηκαλειν...α̣[.].[.]..

8 δανα̣.. after α̣ indefinite ink at top of line, then a trace at the bottom: δανα̣η̣. Siegmann, δανα̣η̣ν̣ Austin, which is compatible | then a hole in the papyrus, surrounded by specks of ink; hor. joining top of vert. from the right; thick vert. trace (ink broken away in the middle); then some high ink (perh. suggesting a rounded letter); some vert. ink; before ε a big rounded trace, perh. part of β (of which there is no clear example in this papyrus, but cf. col. I 6].): θ Siegmann, but θ would be much smaller; then top of letter followed by slightly sloping vert., ν̣ would fit nicely: ι Austin, but ι would be less sloping; then c̣ or ε̣ (ο̣ or θ̣ less likely): ε̣ Siegmann, c Austin; after this indefinite traces of one letter, followed by a high curved trace (I am not sure whether this is ink), perh. joined to a vert. at its left; blotted ink; before α ν̣ compatible, but far from cogent | πο̣τε̣ trace and space exclude πατ; after τ certainly a rounded letter, not η: "kaum πα̣τη̣[ρ" Siegmann || **10** cταν̣ω̣νων apparently a mistake: "γο̣ sieht eher aus wie ν̣ω̣" Siegmann || **15** between αλ̣ and η̣νηc there is really room for only one letter, blotted μ̣ possible || **16** π̣.[after π a vertical trace: πα̣[or πε̣[Siegmann, π̣ε̣[Austin || **17** δ̣[.]τ there may be room for two narrow letters in the gap (cf. δετ earlier in the line): "τουτ̣[kaum. mögl.; [ε] etwas kurz" Siegmann || **18** ο̣c: rather ε̣c than ο̣c Siegmann, but ο̣ seems fairly certain, even though it does not account for all the ink || **19** απ̣α̣ιδ̣ι̣α̣ι̣: απαιδιαc̣ possible Siegmann, but this is not favoured by the trace, cf. the preceding ι || **20** αγν̣.c: not αγν̣α̣c Siegmann, but the traces could be explained as α̣ (point of loop to the left of the gap and upper part of loop and oblique linked to c to the right) || **23** before ω there is a little oblique stroke (hardly more than a prolonged dot) in the margin; a similar sign, although placed a little lower, seems visible before col. III 12 (cf. intr. 3.1) || **25** after καλειν a little rounded trace with a little ink below, θ̣, ρ̣, ο̣ or perhaps ε̣ conceivable: c̣ Siegmann, but I think c would produce a bigger trace (and show an opening to the right); then two verticals, the second a little shorter than the first and slightly sloping to the left, π̣ would fit nicely: ε̣ Siegmann; then a vert. trace: space allows only ι̣ or ρ̣; then α̣ pretty certain; after this indefinite traces; [.]..: [.]ο̣ Siegmann, which is compatible.

Δανάην . . . . . ε . . . . . . Ἀκρίσιός ποτε.
Δανάης δὲ Περσεὺς ἐγένετ' ἐκ χρυσορρύτων
σταγόνων, ὃς ἐλθὼν Γοργόνος καρατόμος
Αἰθίοπ' ἔγημεν Ἀνδρομέδαν τὴν Κηφέως,
ἣ τριπτύχους ἐγείνατ' ἐκ Περσέως κόρους·
Ἀλκαῖον ἠδὲ Cθένελον, ὅς τ' Ἄργους πόλιν
ἔ[c]χεν Μυκήνας, πατέρα δ' Ἀλκμήνης τρίτον
Ἠλεκτρύωνα· Ζ[ε]ὺς δ' ἐς Ἀλκμήνης λέχος
πε[c]ὼν τὸ κλειν[ὸ]ν Ἡρακλέους σπείρει δέμας.
Ὕλλος δὲ τοῦδ[ε], Τήμενος δ' Ὕλλου πατρός,
ὃς Ἄργος ᾤκησ' Ἡρακλέους γεγὼς ἄπο.
ἀπαιδίαι δὲ χρώμενος πατὴρ ἐμὸς
Τήμενος ἐς ἁγνὰς ἦλθε Δωδώνης πτύχας
τέκνων ἔρωτι· τῆς δ' ὁμωνύμου Διὸς
πρόπολ[ο]ς Διώνης εἶπε Τημένωι τάδε·
"ὦ παῖ πεφυκὼς ἐκ γονῶν Ἡρακλέους,
Ζεύς c[οι] δίδωσι παῖδ', ἐγὼ μαντεύομαι,
ὃν Ἀρχ[έλ]αον χρὴ καλεῖν . . . α[.].[.]. .

8 Δανάην θύγατρα non probat Siegmann, Δ. φοβηθεὶς χρησμὸν e.g. Austin (Δ. φοβηθεὶς ὄψιν? Page apud Austin), Δ. χολωθεὶς? Snell apud Austin || **14** vel ε[ἶ]χεν Siegmann || **16** vel πα[ρ]ὼν (vel μο[λ]ὼν vel ἐλ[θ]ὼν) Siegmann || **17** τούτ[ου] non probat Siegmann || **20** vel ἁγνῆς (Siegmann) || **25** καλεῖν cε Siegmann.

col. III

. .
ηρ̣α̣[
επε̣[
ει.[
ολο.[
κα[
. . .[
cυ.[
ο̣ϲ̣.[
. .[
α.[
ζ[
ʹ μ̣[
α̣.[
.

col. III 2 ε̣[: ο̣[Görschen || **3** .[π[(Siegmann), τ̣[or μ̣[conceivable || **4** .[thin upright: ολο̣ι̣[or οπ̣η̣[Siegmann || **6** . . .[the first letter is open at the right and three cross-strokes are visible, but ink may have broken away, so ε̣ or θ̣; the second letter is η rather than κ̣, as it is a little small for κ: εκ[Siegmann, θ̣η̣[rather than ε̣κ̣[Austin || **7** .[: π̣[or δ[Siegmann, but δ would be more oblique || **8** .[: γ[Siegmann, but π̣[also possible | λε̣γ[rightly rejected by Siegmann || **9** very blotted; first letter might be ε̣ or ϲ̣; of the second I can make nothing: ϲ̣τ̣[or ν̣[Siegmann || **10** .[ν̣[or ρ[(Siegmann) fits || **11** ζ[Görschen, Austin: ξ̣[Siegmann || **12** ʹμ̣[the letter at the edge of the papyrus looks very much like μ[(some ink of the right leg seems visible at the edge): ε̣λ̣[, ε̣μ̣[or α̣λ̣[Siegmann, α̣μ̣[Görschen | in the margin there is a little oblique stroke as in col. II 23; between the stroke and μ[there is some blotted ink, but no room for a letter; Siegmann noticed that if the first letter were α, the oblique stroke would be part of it; if so, the left leg of my μ[would also be part of the loop of α, but I think that it is too rounded for that || **13** α̣ traces of loop visible: δ̣ Siegmann

*fr. 229 = 3 A

(ΧΟ.?) βαcιλεῦ χώρας τῆc πολυβώλου,
Κιcceῦ, πεδίον πυρὶ μαρμαίρει

fr. 230 = 4 A

(ΧΟ.?) οὐ γὰρ ὑπερθεῖν κύματος ἄκραν
δυνάμεcθ'· ἔτι γὰρ θάλλει πενία
κακὸν ἔχθιcτον, φεύγει δ'ὄλβοc

fr. 231 = 5 A

(ΑΡΧ.?) ἡμῶν τί δῆτα τυγχάνειc χρείαν ἔχων;
ΚΙC.? πατέρων γὰρ ἐcθλῶν ἐλπίδαc δίδωc γεγώc

fr. 232 = 6 A

ἐν τοῖc τέκνοιc γὰρ ἀρετὴ τῶν εὐγενῶν
ἔλαμψε, κρείccων τ'ἐcτὶ πλουcίου γάμου

***fr. 229** D.H. *Comp.* 203 (2, 129, 14 Usener-Radermacher) τὸ δ'ἐπὶ τούτωι παραλαμβανόμενον κῶλον ἐξ ἀναπαίcτων cύγκειται ῥυθμῶν καὶ προάγει μέχρι ποδῶν ὀκτὼ τὸ αὐτὸ cχῆμα διαcῶιζον ..., ὅμοιον τῶι παρ' Εὐριπίδηι τῶιδε (τῶι *P M*, ὦ *V*) '...'; ad *Archelaum* rettulit Musgrave 3, 607
fr. 230 Stob. IV 32 b 39 (5, 794, 3 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου. Χο. '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A*; poetae nomen om. et fr. 230 et 248 uno lemmate ἀρχελάω (corr. ex ἀρχελάου S^1) comprendit *S*; praef. χορ *S*, om. *M A*
fr. 231 Stob. IV 29 c 42 (5, 719, 13 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (ecl. 42-49 lemmate ευριπιδου ὅλον compr. *S*)
fr. 232 Stob. IV 29 c 44 (5, 720, 4 Hense) ἐν ταὐτῶι (praecedit fr. 242) '...', ecl. hab. *S M A* (3-4 om. *S*), cum lemm. ἐν ταυτ *S* (de quo vide ad fr. 231), εὐριπί (τοῦ αὐτοῦ *A*) ἀρχελάω *M A* | 1-2 post 3-4 locari voluerunt Barnes 2, 457 et Musgrave 3, 551

***fr. 229 1** βαcιλεῦ *M V*: βαcιλεῖ *P* | πολυβώλου *P M*: πολυβόλου *V* || **2** πεδίον *M V*: παιδι(ον) *P*
fr. 230 3 δυνάμεcθα . τί γάρ; Bothe 80
fr. 232 1 ἡ ἀρετὴ *libri* | ἀρετή τε τῶν *S M* || **2** ἔλαμψε Nauck: ἒν ἔλαβε *S M*, ἔλαβε (om. ἒν) *A*; ἐνέλαμψε Valckenaer 162 f., λέλαμπε L. Dindorf, *ThGL* s.v. ἐλλάμπω (3, 757 b), διέλαμψε Cobet[1] 605 (≅ id. Mnem. N.S. 2, 1874, 437 ≅ id.[2] 256 [= id.[3] 216]); ἔβλαcτε G. Wolff, *Sophokles. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. 3 Antigone*, Leipzig 1856, ad v. 38 (teste Nauck), ἀνέλαβε Ellis 256 | κρείccων *S M*, κρεῖccον *A* ||

† πένης γὰρ οὐκ ἐκεῖν' ἀπώλεσεν
τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς γενναῖον

fr. 233 = 7 A

cοὶ δ' εἶπον, ὦ παῖ, τὰς τύχας ἐκ τῶν πόνων
θηρᾶν· ὁρᾶις γὰρ πατέρα cὸν τιμώμενον

fr. 234 = 8 A

πατρὸς δ' ἀνάγκη παιcὶ πείθεcθαι λόγωι

fr. 235 = 9 A

πλουτεῖς· ὁ πλοῦτος δ' ἀμαθία δειλόν θ' ἅμα

fr. 236 = 10 A

cὺν μυρίοιcι τὰ καλὰ γίγνεται πόνοιc

fr. 233 Stob. III 29, 13 (3, 629, 6 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S*, om. *M A*
fr. 234 Stob. IV 25, 19 (4, 623, 5 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. sine lemm. hab. *S*, addito lemmate *M A*, om. *Tr.*
fr. 235 Stob. IV 31 c 69 (5, 757, 14 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A*, fab. nom. om. *S*, qui ecl. 54-64 et 69-75 uno lemmate Εὐρ. comprendit
fr. 236 Stob. III 29, 44 (3, 636, 3 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. εὐριπι^{δ} ἀρχελ^{α} (infra α lineola) *S*, om. *M A* | Men. *Mon.* 252 (Jaekel) | Arsen. 47, 9 et 36, 24 (Apostol. 15, 76 a [*CPG* 2, 647, 18]) '...' Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι

3 πένηc γὰρ ⟨ὤν τιc⟩ Hartung 2, 559, κρεῖccον – γάμου. Πένηc γὰρ ⟨ὢν ὅδ⟩ οὐκ C. G. Cobet, Mnem. N.S. 2, 1874, 437, κρεῖccον – γάμου / ⟨γένοc⟩· πένηc Nauck, κρείccων – γάμου / πένηc γὰρ οὐκ ἐκεῖν' ἀπώλεcεν, πατρὸc/γενναῖον J. Kvíčala, Česke Mus. Fil. 7, 1901, 419 (non probat Hense); fortasse ⟨ἀνὴρ⟩ πένηc vel πένηc ⟨ἀνήρ⟩ | ἀπωλέcε *A*
fr. 233 2 πατέρα cὸν Bothe 81: cὸν πατέρα *S*
fr. 234 λόγωι: λόγων *M*
fr. 235 ἀμαθια sine acc. *M* | θ' αὔμα *M* | corruptum putat versum Nauck, ἀμαθίαν ἔχει θαμά vel ἀμαθίαc γέμει θαμά vel ἀμαθίαι δοῦλον θαμά vel ἀμαθίαν δεινὸc (-ὸν?) τρέφειν H. van Herwerden, Mnem. N.S. 17, 1889, 269 (cf. Mnem. N.S. 20, 1892, 435), ἀμαθίαι δειλὸν θαμά Walker[1] 11
fr. 236 cὺν μυρίοιcι Stob. *S*, Arsen.: ἐν μυρίοιcι Men. (ἐν μυρίοιc τὰ cῖτα καλὰ γηπόνοιc Men. *W*) | γίνεται Arsen. 36, 24

fr. 237 = 11 A

νεανίαν γὰρ ἄνδρα χρὴ τολμᾶν ἀεί·
οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὢν ῥάιθυμος εὐκλεὴς ἀνήρ,
ἀλλ' οἱ πόνοι τίκτουσι τὴν εὐανδρίαν

fr. 238 = 12 A

οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἡδέως ζητῶν βιοῦν (?)
εὔκλειαν εἰσεκτήσατ' (?), ἀλλὰ χρὴ πονεῖν

fr. 239 = 13 A

ὁ δ' ἡδὺς αἰὼν ἡ κακή τ' ἀνανδρία

fr. 237 Stob. IV 10, 4 (4, 328, 9 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* | Orion *Floril.* [9], 22 (4, 266, 26 Meineke) '...' (fabulae nom. om.; ecl. 1-22 uno lemmate Εὐριπίδου compr.) | Arsen. 36, 98 et 50, 53 (Apostol. 11, 98 a [*CPG* 2, 541, 12]) '...' Εὐριπίδου || **2-3** Stob. III 29, 32 (3, 633, 3 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (tamquam capitis primam), sine lemm. *Br.* (post ecl. III 29, 31 a = fr. 1043); τ̆ αυ^{τ} αρχελ^{α} (compendium infra α) *S*; recurrit ecloga sine lemmate cum fr. 1043 coniuncta *corp. Par.* 668 Elter | Arsen. 41, 80 et 52, 86 (Apostol. 13, 45 a [*CPG* 2, 585, 19]) '...' Εὐριπίδου || **3** ≅ Stob. IV 10, 26, 7 (4, 334, 4 Hense = fr. 1052, 7)
fr. 238 Stob. III 29, 14 (3, 629, 9 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου '...', ecl. hab. *S M A*, τ̆αυ^{τ} nec plura *S* (praecedit fr. 233), εὐρ. ἀρχελάου *M*, εὐρ. ἀρχελάωι *A*
fr. 239 Stob. III 8, 13 (3, 343, 7 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S*, *M A*, *Br.*; poetae nom. om. *Br.* | eidem versus a Stobaeo III 29, 22 (3, 631, 1 Hense) Euripidis *Erectheo* adscribuntur hoc iambo praemisso ἐκ τῶν πόνων τοι τἀγάθ' αὔξεται βροτοῖς (fr. 364) | item ab Orione *Floril.* 7, 2 (4, 259, 17 Meineke) cum lemm. ἐκ τοῦ Ἐρεχθέως ||**2** Phryn. 21, 3 De Borries ἀπορθοῦν [ἀνορθοῦν male Mette] πόλιν ἢ οἰκίαν hunc versum respicere putat Mette[5] 85 (F 294)

fr. 237 1 ἄνδρα Stob., Arsen.: ὄντα Orion | ἀεί Stob., Arsen.: πονεῖν Orion || **2-3** om. Arsen. 50, 53 || **2** γὰρ ὢν om. *corp. Par.*, Arsen. 52, 86 | ῥάιθυμος Stob., Arsen.: ἄθυμος Orion | εὐκλεὴς Stob., Orion, Arsen.: γρ. εὐγενὴς superscr. *A*[2] in Stob. III 29, 32 || **3** εὐανδρίαν Stob. III 29, 32, Orion, Arsen. 41, 80 et 52, 86, Stob. IV 10, 26, 7: εὐδοξίαν Stob. IV 10, 4, Arsen. 36, 98 et 50, 53
fr. 238 1 syllabae υκ ἔστιν in ras. *M*[2] ut mox σ extr. in voce οστις | ἡδέως ζητῶν βιοῦν Euripidi abiudicat Hense, ἡδέος ζῆλωι βίου A. Nauck, Phil. 12, 1857, 643, ἡδονῆς ζηλῶν βίον Gomperz 1, 179 ff., ἥσυχον ζηλῶν βίον Cobet[2] 256 (= id.[3] 216), ἡδονὰς ζητῶν βίου G. Vitelli, *Appunti critici sulla Elettra di Euripide*, Torino/Roma 1880, 11 f. et Papageorgios 38 || **2** εὔκλειαν εἰσεκτήσατ' *S A*, ε. εἰς ἐκτήσατ' *M*, ε. εἶτ' ἐκτήσατ' vel e.g. ε. ἐξηνέγκατ' Nauck l.c. (ε. εἶτ' ἐκτήσατ' etiam Nauck ad loc.: "dummodo ἡδονὰς ζητῶν βίου vs. 1 scripseris cum Vitellio ... et Pappageorgio"; prob. Van Herwerden[1] 38 f.), εὐδοξίαν ἐκτήσατ' Cobet[1] 295 (≅ id.[2] 256 ≅ id.[3] 216), ε. ἂν κτήσαιτ' ἂν Blaydes 113
fr. 239 1 εῶν Stob. III 29, 22 *M*, ἀγὼν Orion | ἡ κακίστ' Orion (teste Schneidewin) | ἀτολμία Stob. III 29, 22, Orion ||

οὔτ' οἶκον οὔτε πόλιν ἀνορθώσειεν ἄν

fr. 240 = 14 A

ἐμὲ δ'ἄρ' οὐ
μοχθεῖν δίκαιον; τίς δ' ἄμοχθος εὐκλεής;
τίς τῶν μεγίστων δειλὸς ὢν ὠρέξατο;

fr. 241 = 15 A

ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν σὸν κρᾶτ' ἀναστέψαι θέλω

fr. 242 = 16 A

φέρει δὲ καὶ τοῦτ' οὐχὶ μικρόν, εὐγενὴς
ἀνὴρ στρατηγῶν εὐκλεᾶ τ'ἔχων φάτιν

fr. 243 = 17 A

ὀλίγον ἄλκιμον δόρυ

fr. 240 Stob. IV 10, 8 (4, 330, 5 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. hab. *S M A* (lemma praefixum est in *M A*, in *S* eclogae 8, 10 [fr. 702] et 11 [fr. 244] uno lemmate αρχελᾶ in margine comprenduntur poetae nom. omisso, τοῦ αὐτοῦ *A* [praecedit fr. 1051])
fr. 241 Σ *T A B Ph.* 1149 (1, 371, 17 Schwartz) ἀμφίβολον πότερον τὰς κρᾶτας εἶπεν ἢ τοὺς κρᾶτας· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν Ἀρχελάωι '...' · καὶ Ὅμηρος ἀμφιβόλως εἴρηκεν 'κράτων τυπτομένων' (*Od.* 22, 309) καὶ Ἴων 'τύπτου τὸν αὐτοῦ κρᾶτα (*TrGF* 1, 19 F 61)
fr. 242 Stob. IV 13, 11 (4, 349, 12 Hense) ἐν ταυτῶι (praecedit fr. 243) '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* | Stob. IV 29 c 43 (5, 720, 1 Hense) ἐν ταυτῶι (praecedit fr. 231) '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (ἐν τῶι αὐτῶι *A*, de *S* vide ad fr. 231)
fr. 243 Stob. IV 13, 10 (4, 349, 9 Hense) Εὐριπίδης Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* | fr. cum fr. 244 coniunxit Barnes 2, 457

2 οὐ τὸ ἴσον Stob. III 29, 22, sed οὔτ' οἶκον corr. *M*[1] | πόλιν ἀνορθώσειεν ἄν Valckenaer apud Gaisford, R. Porson, *Adversaria*, Cantabrigiae 1812, 275: πόλιν ὀρθώσειεν ἄν Stob. III 8, 13 *S M*[d] *A*, γαῖαν ὀρθώσειεν ἄν Stob. III 8, 13 *Br.*, Orion (def. Wagner 674), οὔτε βίοτον (βίωτον *S M*) οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ (ὠφελεῖν *S*) Stob. III 29, 22, π. ἀπορθώσειεν ἄν A. Meineke, Phil. 14, 1859, 18, π. ἂν ὀρθώσειεν ἄν Blaydes 113
fr. 240 2 ἄμοχθος Grotius[1] 195: ἀμόχθητος *libri*, τί δ' ἀμόγητον εὐκλεές Bothe 82 || **3** a prioribus versibus separari voluit C. Badham, *Euripides, Ἰφιγένεια ἡ ἐν Ταύροις. Ἑλένη ...*, Londini 1851, 13 | δειλὸς ex δεινὸς corr. *S*[1]
fr. 241 κρᾶτ': κρᾶτα *T A B* | ἀναστέψαι *A*: ἀναστρέψαι *T B*
fr. 242 1 φέρει Stob. IV 29 c 43: ἔχει Stob. IV 13, 11, σθένει? Nauck | οὐχὶ Stob. IV 13, 11: οὐ Stob. IV 29 c 43 | σμικρὸν Stob. IV 29 c 43 *A*[1] || **2** ἀνὴρ γὰρ Stob. IV 13, 11 *M*

κρεῖccον cτρατηγῶι μυρίου cτρατεύματοc

fr. 244 = 18 A

ὀλίγοι γὰρ ἐcθλοὶ κρείccονεc πολλῶν κακῶν

fr. 244 Stob. IV 10, 11 (4, 330, 14 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (τοῦ αὐτοῦ *A* [praecedit fr. 702], de *S* vide ad fr. 240) | Orion *Floril.* 7, 3 (4, 259, 21 Meineke) ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρχελάου '...'

fr. 243 2 cτρατηγῶι Grotius[1] 205 (prob. Gomperz 1, 114f.): cτρατηγοῦ *codd.*, κακάνδρου Matthiae 9, 88, cάφ' ἡγοῦ J. Conington, Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology 1, 1854, 337, ταπεινοῦ F. W. Schmidt 2, 454, cτρατηγοῦν? Ellis 256, πονηροῦ sim. Hense ad loc., κατηφοῦc T. G. Tucker, CR 18, 1904, 194
fr. 244 ὀλίγοι in παῦροι mutare voluit Nauck

POxy. 3, 419 (transcript)

. . .
]νμεν[
]ρονημα̣[
]κτεινοντ'ἀχ̣[
]αρωϲεμελλεπ̣[
]η̣θειϲπαρ̣ω̣τε̣[
]βαναξκαθιζε̣π̣[
]τ̣ωπαιπροβαλ̣λ̣[
]νονπροφωνῶ[
]ε̣λ̣θ\ι/ῆϲπαρονϲο̣[
]τωνεϲωθε⟦ν⟧κᾱ̣[
]ν̣·ειδευτυχῆϲ⟦ω⟧\ού/ϲ[
]ε̣ϲτωτολοιπον[
]νδραχρηδ̣ι̣α̣τ̣ων̣[
]ν̣αμεραν·
]εϊγαρ̣αιτυ̣χα[
]ι̣τ̣ό̣ν̣θρε⟦ό⟧\κ/[
. . . . .

(this transcript is merely a copy of Grenfell and Hunt's [cf. intr. 3.2])

POxy. 3, 419 + fr. 245 = 19 A

]ν μεν[
]ρονημα[
– ∪ –]κτείνοντ' ἄχ[
– ∪ –]αρωc ἔμελλε π[
– ∪ –]ηθειc παρωτε[
– ∪ Φοῖ]β' ἄναξ, κάθιζε π[
– ∪ –]τ', ὦ παῖ, προβαλλ[
ἓν δέ coι μό˯νον προφωνῶ˛· μὴ 'πὶ δουλείαν ποτὲ
ζῶν ἑκὼν˯ ἔλθηιc παρόν co˛ι κατθανεῖν ἐλευθέρωι
]των ἔcωθε κα̣[
– ∪ –]ν· εἰ δ' εὐτυχήcουc' [
– ∪ –]εcτω τὸ λοιπὸν [
ἄ]νδρα χρὴ δ̣ι̣α̣τ̣ω̣ν̣[
]ν̣ ἁμέραν·
]εῖ γὰρ αἱ τύχα[ι
]ι̣τ̣ό̣ν̣θ̣ρεκ̣[

P.Oxy. 3, 419 + fr. 245 1-16 *POxy.* 3, 419 || **8-9** Stob. III 7, 4 (3, 309, 7 Hense) Εὐριπίδηc Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *M A Mac.*

P.Oxy. 3, 419 + fr. 245 2 φ]ρονημα[τ Von Arnim || **3**]κτείνοντ' Austin, ἐ]κτείνοντ'? | ἄχ[ρηcτον? Grenfell-Hunt || **4** ἀνι]αρῶc? Grenfell-Hunt, γ]ὰρ ὡc Page apud Austin || **5** παρωτε[Von Arnim || **6** Φοῖ]β' vel Πόλυ]β' Blass 277, ἀλλὰ Φοῖ]β' ἄναξ κάθιζε Von Arnim | κάθιζε: vel καθῖζε Austin || **7**]τω, παῖ diviserunt omnes, οὐ τόδ' αἰ]τῶ, παῖ, προβάλλ[ειν τὸν βίον c'ἀνωφελῶc Von Arnim, πρόβαλλ[ε Grenfell-Hunt, προβάλ-λ[ου? Blass || **8** προφωνῶ *M*[d]: προφανῶ *A Mac.*| μὴ'πὶ δουλείαν *Mac.*: μὴ πίδοῦ λείαν *M*[d], μή που δειλίαν *A* || **9** ἐλευθέρωι Nauck: ἐλευθέρωc *codd.* || **10**]τῶν ἔcωθεν κᾶ[Von Arnim || **11** εὐτυχὴc [ω]c[(ου supra ω) Grenfell-Hunt, εὐτυχήcουc'[Von Arnim || **12**]ἔcτω Von Arnim, εὐ]εcτώ? Radt per litteras || **13** ἄ]νδρα Grenfell-Hunt, οὔποτ' ἄ]νδρα χρὴ διὰ τῶν [_ Blass, δι'αἰῶν'[e.g. Snell apud Austin || **15** τύχα[ι Grenfell-Hunt, ἐν βραχ]εῖ γὰρ αἱ τύχα[ι Blass || **16**]ι τ̣ό̣ν̣ θ̣ρεκ̣[diviserunt omnes

fr. 246 = 20 A

νεανίας τε καὶ πένης σοφός θ'ἅμα·
ταῦτ' εἰς ἓν ἐλθόντ' ἄξι' ἐνθυμήσεως

fr. 247 = 21 A

τί δ' οὐκ ἂν εἴη χρηστὸς ὄλβιος γεγώς;

fr. 248 = 22 A

οὐκ ἔστι Πενίας ἱερὸν αἰσχίστης θεοῦ·
μισῶ γὰρ ὄντως οἵτινες φρονοῦσι μέν,
φρονοῦσι δ' †οὐδενός τε† χρημάτων ὕπερ

fr. 249 = 23 A

μὴ πλούσιον θῇς· ἐνδεέστερος γὰρ ὢν
ταπεινὸς ἔσται· κεῖνο δ'ἰσχύει μέγα,
πλοῦτος λαβὼν ⟨τε⟩ τοῦτον εὐγενὴς ἀνήρ

fr. 246 Stob. IV 11, 9 (4, 339, 9 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A L* (ἀρχελ^{α} *S*, ἀρχελάου *M*, ἀρχελάω *A*, fab. nom. om. *L*) | Arsen. 36, 100 (Apostol. 11, 98 c [*CPG* 2, 541, 16]) '...' Εὐριπίδου
fr. 247 Stob. IV 31 a 17 (5, 738, 15 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *M A*, om. *S*
fr. 248 Stob. IV 32 b 41 (5, 794, 10 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A*; poetae nomen om. *S*, qui ecl. 39 (fr. 230) et 41 uno lemmate ἀρχελάω (corr. ex -λάου S^1) compr. | **2-3** a primo versu separari vult Musgrave 3, 552
fr. 249 Stob. IV 31 a 19 (5, 739, 5 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A*

fr. 246 1 θ'ἅμα *L*: τ'ἅμα *S M*, ἅμα *A* || **2** ἐνθυμήσεως: ἐνθυμήσεων *A*
fr. 247 εἴη *M*: ἢ *A*
fr. 248 1 αἰσχίστης: ἐχθίστης Bergk (teste Nauck), οὔτοι τι πενίας χεῖρον, ἐχθίστης θεᾶς F. W. Schmidt 2, 454, ἐχθίστης θεῶν Blaydes 113, fort. αἰσχίστης θεῶν (vide comm.) || **2** μισῶ γὰρ ὄντως: μισῶ δὲ πάντας Schmidt | φρονοῦσι: ex μισω corr. S^1 || **3** οὐδενός τε *codd.*: οὐδενός γε Gesner in margine, οὐδενὸς ἤ τε Grotius[1] 385, οὐδὲν ὥς γε Wakefield (teste Nauck), οὐδέν, πλὴν γε G. Hermann, *Euripidis Hecuba* ..., Lipsiae 1800, 172 (ad v. 1192), οὐδέν, ὥστε anonymus apud Gaisford, οὐδενές γε Bothe 83, οὐδὲν τῶν γε H. Duentzer, Phil. 5, 1850, 187, οὔ, δέον γε Munro 236; οὐδὲν χρημάτων ὑπέρτερον A. J. E. Pflugk, *Schedae Criticae*, Gedani 1835, 5, οὐδενός γ'ἀχρημάτων ὕπερ Welcker 2, 705 n. 8, οὐδὲν ὥστε χρήματ' εὐπορεῖν Tucker 351; πονοῦσι δ' οὐδὲν ὥς γε χρημάτων ὕπερ Schmidt
fr. 249 3 ⟨τε⟩ add. Gesner: om. *S M A*, πλοῦτον λαβὼν δ'ὀγκοῖτ'ἂν Holzner 42 f.

fr. 250 = 24 A

τυραννίδ' ἣ θεῶν δευτέρα νομίζεται·
τὸ μὴ θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει, τὰ δ'ἄλλ' ἔχει

fr. 251 = 25 A

κρείϲϲω γὰρ οὔτε δοῦλον οὔτ' ἐλεύθερον
τρέφειν ἐν οἴκοιϲ ἀϲφαλὲϲ τοῖϲ ϲώφροϲιν

fr. 252 = 26 A

ἐκ τῶν δικαίων γὰρ νόμοι ταὐξήματα
μεγάλα φέρουϲι, πάντα δ'ἀνθρώποιϲ ⟨⏑ –⟩
τάδ' ἐϲτὶ χρήματ', ἤν τιϲ εὐϲεβῆι θεόν

fr. 253 = 27 A

ἁπλοῦϲ ὁ μῦθοϲ· μὴ λέγ'εὖ· τὸ γὰρ λέγειν

fr. 250 Stob. IV 6, 5 (4, 240, 1 Hense) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (praecedunt *Ph.* 503 sqq., 524 sq.) Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *M A*, om. *S* (sed τ̆ αὐ ἀρχε [ε cum ligatura] adscribit ecl. 6, ubi *M A* hab. lemm. τοῦ αὐτοῦ Αἰγεῖ)
fr. 251 Stob. IV 19, 11 (4, 424, 9 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (ἀρχελάου *M*)
fr. 252 Orion *Floril.* 3, 1 (4, 253, 1 Meineke) ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρχελάου Εὐριπίδου '...'
fr. 253 Stob. III 34, 2 (3, 682, 10 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab *S M*, om. *A*; iterat ecl. et lemma Εὐριπίδ⟨ου⟩ *corp. Par.* 683 Elter | Stob. III 13, 9 (3, 455, 4 Hense) '...', ecl. hab. poetae nomine non iterato (praecedunt fr. 165 et *TrGF* 2, F 553), fabulae omisso *L*, om. *S M A*

fr. 250 1 τυραννίδ' ἣ θεῶν δευτέρα Gaisford 2, 294: τυραννίδα ἠθῶν β̃ *M*, τυραννιδ^{a} ἡ θεῶν β̃ *A*, τυραννὶϲ εἶναι θεῶν βίοϲ νομίζεται Gesner || **2** ante οὐκ littera rasa *A* | τὰ δ'ἄλλ Grotius[1] 181: τἄλλα δ' *M A*, οὐκ ἔχουϲα τ'ἄλλ' ἔχει Busche 664
fr. 251 1 κρείϲϲω A. J. E. Pflugk, Allgem. Schul-Zeitung 2, 1831, 21: κρεῖϲϲον *S M A* (def. Ellis 257) | γὰρ οὔτε *Tr.*: γάρ τε *S M A* || **2** ϲώφροϲιν *M A*: ϲώφροϲι *S*
fr. 252 1 ἐκ Meineke: ε̣ἰ̣ *cod.*, del. Schneidewin 74 ("fort. τῶν γὰρ δικαίων οἱ νόμοι ταυξήματα"), οἱ Ranke apud Schneidewin 75 (οἱ – δόμοι Van Herwerden[1] 399, οἱ – πόνοι Holzner 44), ϲὺν τῶι δικαίωι Nauck in *TGF*[1] | νόμοι ταὐξήματα Schneidewin, Austin: νόμοι τ' αὐξήματα *cod.*, νομοί τ' αὐξήματα Gomperz 1, 181 f. || **2** ⟨τάδε⟩ Schneidewin, ἀνθρώποιϲ⟨ί τοι⟩ Ranke, ⟨ἀεὶ⟩ Kayser 126, ⟨βρύει⟩ Gomperz, ⟨ἴϲα⟩ Walker[1] 12 (inter alia), F. Ferrari, SIFC 50, 1978, 232 f.; πάντα τ' – ⟨ἀεὶ⟩ Welcker 3, 1596, πάντα τ' ἀνθρώπει' ⟨ἀεὶ⟩? Meineke; πάντα δ'ὀρθοῦται βροτοῖϲ Stadtmueller, WKPh 7, 1890, 287, πάντα τοῖϲ βροτοῖϲ ⟨ἐπεὶ⟩ Holzner || ante **3** aliquid de εὐϲεβείαι excidisse coni. Meineke 4 XLIV, qui 3 ab 1-2 separare voluit; prob. Mette[5] 88 (F 313) || **3** τάδ' ἐϲτὶ: πάρεϲτι Schneidewin, ἐν τῶιδε Kayser | θεόν: θεούϲ? Nauck
fr. 253 1 ⟨τῆϲ ἀληθείαϲ ἔφυ⟩ fort. hunc versum praecessisse coni. Van Herwerden[1] 40 | ἁπλοῦϲ: ἀπλοῦϲ (ἁ rubr.) Stob. III 13, 9 | λέγ' εὖ Stob. III 13, 9 ut videtur: λέγε Stob. III 34, 2 ||

εὖ δεινόν ἐστιν, εἰ φέρει τινὰ βλάβην

fr. 254 = 28 A

(A.) πόλλ', ὦ τέκνον, σφάλλουσιν ἀνθρώπους θεοί.
B. τὸ ῥᾷστον εἶπας, αἰτιάσασθαι θεούς

fr. 255 = 29 A

δοκεῖς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ξυνετὰ νικήσειν ποτὲ
καὶ τὴν Δίκην που μάκρ' ἀπῳκίσθαι βροτῶν·
ἡ δ'ἐγγύς ἐστιν, οὐχ ὁρωμένη δ'ὁρᾶι
ὃν χρὴ κολάζειν τ'οἶδεν· ἀλλ'οὐκ οἶσθα σὺ
ὁπόταν ἄφνω μολοῦσα διολέσηι κακούς

fr. 256 = 30 A

μακάριος ὅστις νοῦν ἔχων τιμᾶι θεὸν
καὶ κέρδος αὑτῶι τοῦτο ποιεῖται μέγα

fr. 254 Plu. *De audiendis poetis* 4, 20 d (1, 40, 4 Paton-Wegehaupt-Pohlenz) ὅπου μὲν οὖν αὐτοὶ τῶι τιθέναι σύνεγγυς ἐκφανεῖς ποιοῦσι τὰς ἀντιλογίας, δεῖ τῶι βελτίονι συνηγορεῖν ὥσπερ ἐν τούτοις '...' (εὐριπίδου *p* in margine) || **1** Justinus M. *De monarchia* 5, 108 C (1, 130 Otto) καὶ ἐν Ἀρχελάωι (praecedit *Ion* 433-451) '...' || **2** Plu. *De Stoicorum repugnantiis* 33, 1049 e (Pohlenz) ἐπαινεῖ (sc. Chrysippus) πάλιν ⟨τὸ⟩ τοῦ Εὐριπίδου λέγοντος 'εἰ θεοί τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρόν, οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί '(fr. 292, 7) καί '...' | ibid. 34, 1049 f οὐχ ἅπαξ ... ἔσται πρὸς Χρύσιππον εἰπεῖν '...'
fr. 255 Stob. 1, 3, 47 (1, 60, 19 Wachsmuth) '...', ecl. sine lemmate hab. *F P* || **1-3** Orion *Floril.* 5, 1 (4, 255, 6 Meineke) ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρχελάου Εὐριπίδου '...'
fr. 256 Orion *Floril.* 3, 2 (4, 253, 7 Meineke) ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δράματος (praecedit fr. 252) || **1** fortasse respicit Men. fr. 101, 1 Koerte μακάριος ὅστις οὐσίαν καὶ νοῦν ἔχει

2 φέρει Stob. III 13, 9: φέροι Stob. III 34, 2, ἐκφέρειν vel καὶ φέρειν F. W. Schmidt, 2, 455 | τινὰ βλάβην: τινὶ βλάβην Bothe 85, βλάβην τινά? Snell apud Austin, fort. βλάβην τινί
fr. 254 1 πόλλ', ὦ: πολλῶι Justinus M. *C* || **2** ἔμπας F. W. Schmidt 2, 455
fr. 255 1 τὰ τῶν θεῶν Orion: τὰ θεῶν σὺ Stob. (σὺ om. *P*) || **2** που μάκρ' Grotius[1] 127 (prioris ser.): που μακρὰν *codd.*, μακρὰν Schneidewin 77 ("qui μακράν γ' scribere debebat" Nauck) | ἀπῳκίσθαι L. C. Valckenaer, *Theocriti Decem Eidyllia*, Lugduni Batavorum 1810[2], 235: ἀπωκίσθαι Stob. *P*, ἀπωκεῖσθαι Stob. *F*, ἀποκεῖσθαι Orion || **3** ἡ δ'ἐγγύς ἐστιν Stob.: ἧδ'ἔστιν ἐγγὺς Orion || post **4** lacunam statuit Van Herwerden[2] 339 || **5** ὁπόταν: ἕως N. Wecklein, Phil. 39, 1880, 414 | fort. ὁπόταν σ' – κακῶς (κακῶς? Radt per litteras)
fr. 256 1 θεὸν: θεούς? Nauck || **2** αὑτῶι Bothe 360: αὐτῷ *cod.*, αὐτῶι Schneidewin, αὐτὸ Ranke apud Schneidewin 75, | ποιεῖται: γίγνεται H. van Herwerden, *ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΙΩΝ*, Traiecti ad Rhenum 1875, 227, ad v. 1251 (contra: F. W. Schmidt 2, 455)

fr. 257 = 31 A

πολλοὺc δ'ὁ θυμὸc ὁ μέγαc ὤλεcεν βροτῶν
ἥ τ'ἀξυνεcία, δύο κακὼ τοῖc χρωμένοιc

fr. 258 = 32 A

τῶι γὰρ βιαίωι κἀγρίωι τὸ μαλθακὸν
εἰc ταὐτὸν ἐλθὸν τοῦ λίαν παρείλετο

fr. 259 = 33 A

ὀργῆι δὲ φαύληι πόλλ' ἔνεcτ' ἀcχήμονα

fr. 260 = 34 A

ἔπαυc' ὀδουροὺc λυμεῶναc

fr. 261 = 35 A

ἔcωcα δούλην οὖcαν· οἱ γὰρ ἥccονεc
τοῖc κρείccοcιν φιλοῦcι δουλεύειν βροτῶν

fr. 257 Stob. III 20, 11 (3, 541, 1 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M*, om. *A*
fr. 258 Stob. III 20, 25 (3, 543, 17 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. cum lemm. εὐριπῖ ἀρχελάω hab. *S*, om. *M A*
fr. 259 Stob. III 20, 12 (3, 541, 4 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι '...', ecl. hab. *S M A* (cum lemm. *M*[d] *A*, τοῦ αὐτοῦ *S* [praecedit fr. 257]) | cum hac ecl. cohaerent fr. 760 et *TrGF* 2, F 523: separavit Grotius[1] 105 (hunc versum male recepit in Men. *Mon.* [687] Meineke: cf. Jaekel XVI)
fr. 260 Σ *E F G Q* Pi. *P.* 2, 57 (2, 42, 12 Drachmann) οὕτω γὰρ καὶ πειρατὰc τοὺc κατὰ πέλαγοc λέγομεν, κυρίωc δὲ τοὺc ἐν ὁδῶι κακουργοῦνταc, παρ' ὃ δὴ καὶ ὀδουροὺc αὐτοὺc λέγουcιν. Εὐριπίδηc ἐν Ἀρχελάωι '...'. καὶ Cοφοκλῆc ἐν Αἰγεῖ (F 22)· 'πῶc δῆθ' ὀδουρῶν †ὅμοιοc† ἐξέβηc λαθών;'
fr. 261 Stob. IV 19, 13 (4, 424, 14 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου ΧΟ. '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A*, chori notam apponit *S* (αρχε̄ χ ο ρ)

fr. 257 1 ὤλεcεν Grotius[1] 103: ὤλεc[ε] (ε add. m. rec.) *S*, ὤλεcε *M*[d] *Tr.* || **2** ἥ τε *S M*[d] | ἀξυνεcία Grotius: ἀcυνεcία *S M*[d] | δύο *S M*[d]: δύω *Tr.*
fr. 258 2 ταὐτὸν Gesner[1] in margine (ταυτὸν): αὐτὸν *S* | παρείλετο *Tr.*: παρείλατο *S*
fr. 260 in fine ⟨ἐμπόρων⟩? Radt per litteras
fr. 261 1 ἔcωcε? vel ἐγῶιδα? Meineke 2 XXXI et 4 LXXI, ἔγνων cε Gomperz 1, 115, ἔcωcε δούλη φῦcά μ' F. W. Schmidt 2, 456, ἥccῶ cὺ δουλεύουc'· ἀεὶ γὰρ ἥccονεc Holzner 45, ἔcωcα δούλην οὐκ ἂν Allen in Allen-Italie 602

fr. 262 = 36 A

πάλαι cκοποῦμαι τὰc τύχαc †τῶν† βροτῶν
ὡc εὖ μεταλλάccουcιν· ὃc γὰρ ἂν cφαλῆι
εἰc ὀρθὸν ἔcτη χὼ πρὶν εὐτυχῶν πίτνει

fr. 263 = 37 A

ἔcτι ⟨τι⟩ καὶ παρὰ δάκρυcι
κείμενον ἡδὺ βροτοῖc, ὅταν
ἄνδρα φίλον cτενάχηι τιc ἐν οἴκωι

fr. 264 = 38 A

τὰ γὰρ οὐκ ὀρθῶc πραccόμεν' ὀρθῶc
τοῖc πράccουcιν κακὸν ἦλθεν

fr. 262 Stob. IV 41, 31 (5, 937, 8 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου '...', ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A* (adest fabulae tantum nomen in *S*; fab. nomen omisit, lemma Ευριπίδου semel adscripsit ecl. 31 et seqq. *Tr.*) | Orion *Floril.* 8, 2 (4, 261, 20 Meineke) ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρχελάου Εὐριπίδου '...'
fr. 263 Stob. IV 54, 7 (5, 1114, 5 Hense) Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάου '...', eccl. cum lemm. hab. *S M A*
fr. 264 Stob. I 3, 35 (1, 58, 16 Wachsmuth) Εὐριπίδης Ἀρχελάωι '...'

fr. 262 1 cκοποῦμαι Stob.: cκοπῶμεν Orion, cκοπῶ μέν? Schneidewin | τὰc τύχαc τῶν βροτῶν Stob., Orion: τὰc τύχαc τὰc τῶν βροτῶν *cod. Paris.* 1985 teste Gaisford, τὰc τύχαc ἐγὼ βροτῶν A. Nauck, *De tragicorum Graecorum fragmentis observationes criticae*, Jahresbericht über das Königl. Joachimsthalsche Gymnasium ..., Berlin 1855, 42, τὰc ἐφημέρων τύχαc O. Hense, *Exercitationes Criticae* ..., Halis 1868, 51 (teste Nauck), τὰc τύχαc πάντων βροτῶν Papageorgios 38, βροτῶν τύχαc, ὅπωc Munro 236, τὰc βροτηcίαc τύχαc Busche 664, τῶν βροτῶν τὰc ξυμφορὰc W. Headlam, JPh 23, 1895, 273 ||**2** ὡc εὖ: ὡc θεοί? Hense, ἀεὶ (vel εἰκῆ) Munro, ὅcoν Bothe 86, Van Herwerden[1] 40, ὡc πνεύματ' ἀλλάccουcιν Tucker 350 | μεταλλάccουcιν Stob. *M*, Orion; μεταλλάcουcιν Stob. *S*, μεταβάλλουcιν Stob. *A* | ὃc γὰρ ἂν cφαλῆι Stob. *S M*: ὃc γὰρ ἂν ἀcφαλῶc Stob. *A*, οὐ γὰρ ἀcφαλῶc Orion, ὡc cφαλῶcι γὰρ Ellis 257 ||**3** χὼ πρὶν εὐτυχῶν πίτνει Stob. (χὸ [vel χ ὁ] *S M A* [sed ut καὶ ὁ scribere in animo habuerit *S*]; πιτνει sine accentu *S*, πίπτει *A*): πίπτει δ' ὁ πρὶν εὐτυχῶν Orion
fr. 263 1 ⟨τι⟩ Meineke 4 XXIV: ⟨δὲ⟩? Hartung 2, 562, H. van Herwerden, Mnem. N.S. 20, 1892, 436 ||**2** κείμενον eo quo legitur loco incommodum in fine sententiae collocari vult F. W. Schmidt 2, 456; delendum putat Van Herwerden ||**3** οἴκωι *M A*: οἴκτωι *S* (def. Blaydes 115)
fr. 264 1 ὀρθόν vel ὀρθήν West 72 ||**2** πράccουcιν *P*: πράccουcι *F*.

COMMENTARY

test. 1

This passage is the main evidence for the dating of the *Archelaos* in 408/7 (see intr. 1.1) and for the theory that the *Archelaos* was written in Macedonia in honour of king Archelaos (cf. also test. 2 and 3). For scepticism about the *Vita* as a source of information see intr. 1.1 n. 1 and the literature quoted there.

test. 2

If we may believe this story, it can be inferred that the *Archelaos* was written on special request, although somewhat modified by Euripides, who took the mythical instead of the historical Archelaos as his subject. But the anecdote need not be authentic: Gösswein on [E.] *ep.* 5, 13 suggests that it may have been invented to explain how Euripides got at such an obscure subject. We have, in fact, no other instances of tragedies celebrating a historical person during his lifetime; Theodektes' *Mausolos* is usually quoted as an example of a play which is celebrating a historical person, albeit after his death, but the evidence (*TrGF* 1, 72 T 6) does not allow any conclusions as to how exactly this was done. S. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, Oxford 1982, 334 ff. (cf. also 261 and 271) argues "that Theodektes' tragedy was an attempt to link the historical Mausolus with a mythical eponymous hero Mausolus, thus legitimating the real Mausolus' dynastic claims. An exactly parallel kind of tragedy is the *Archelaos* of Euripides ..." (p. 336) — but the evidence is scanty. Cf. also intr. 1.5.

*test. 3

These lines seem to indicate that Euripides was pushed to write tragedies (τι ... τῶν εἰωθότων) by Archelaos. Gösswein ad loc. suggests: "In erster Linie dürfte die Anspielung aber auf den 'Archelaos' gemünzt sein, der durch das Genos [i.e. test. 1] bezeugt ist", and surely the *Archelaos* could be looked upon as a suitable payment (μιcθὸν) for Archelaos' hospitality (more so, perhaps, than the *IA*, *Ba.* or *Alcmeon in Corinth*, the other plays written in Macedonia). Whether there is any truth in the statement is of course doubtful, the letters obviously being a late forgery (cf. Gösswein 3 ff., who tends to attribute them to an educated Sophist in II A.D. [p. 29 f.]).

test. 4

See intr. 1.3.

test. 7

This fabula has been generally regarded as a summary of the *Archelaos*, and there can be little doubt that this is right: although one can no longer use the argument that Archelaos is only referred to in relation to the *Archelaos* of Euripides (see below on app. 2 C 1 and 2), it is obvious that this story, culminating in the foundation of Aigai by the mythical Archelaos, is very suitable in a play which was composed with the aim of pleasing the historical Archelaos (cf. test. 1). Siegmann 4 n. 3 suggests that perhaps 4 f. *quia ... fuit* goes back on fr. 2, 18 A Ἡρακλέους γεγὼς ἄπο: "das würde beweisen, dass Hygin wirklich direkt von Euripides abhängig ist", but the connection does not seem cogent (see comm. below). Another attempt to 'prove' that *fab.* 219 is based on Euripides was made by Webster 255: "The anapaestic address to Kisseus by the chorus (229 N²) shows that in fact Kisseus is the king and that therefore Hyginus *Fab.* 219 is based on Euripides" (similarly Lowicka 264). But fr. 229 was attributed to the *Archelaos* by Musgrave because the address to Kisseus seemed to fit in with Hyg. *fab.* 219!

The following commentary has been written on the assumption that the fabula offers a faithful summary of Euripides' play, but it must be borne in mind throughout that these fabulae did not really have such pretensions; see intr. *Kresph.* test. 5.

1 Archelaus Temeni filius: from fr. 2, 19 ff. A it is clear that he was the eldest son (cf. also app. 2 C 2, 11 f. Ἀρχέλαος ὁ πρεσβύτατος ... Τημενιδῶν [?] ...).

exsul a fratribus eiectus: at the reasons for his exile we can only guess. Siegmann suggested that it was the result of a misunderstanding of the oracle on his birth (fr. 2, 24 f. A), which was wrongly interpreted, as if Archelaos had to be ἀρχέλαος 'leader of the people' in Argos, and led to a quarrel with the other Temenids (Siegmann 7 f.). This is certainly a possibility. But one still wonders why his claims at power were thwarted, he being the eldest son and, one would expect, the legitimate heir. Webster 253, too, felt troubled about the respective age of Archelaos and his brothers, wondering "how his ... younger brothers managed to drive Archelaos into exile (...) while he was himself still a young man (237 N²)". But as they need not have been much younger and νεανίας is not necessarily 'a youth' (see comm. on fr. 237), I think this is not a serious difficulty.

in Thraciam: I have accepted Robert's correction, for which cf. Robert² 2, 669 n. 4, where the corruption is explained as caused by the occurrence of *in*

Macedoniam in 13, and *in Thraciam* defended by the appearance of Kisseus as king (see comm. on fr. 229) and Thracia's being not far from Macedonia (also in Paus. 9, 40, 8 Kisseus is said to be king of the country which 'borders on Macedonia'). It would of course be very awkward to have Archelaos first come to Macedonia in 1 and then fly to Macedonia in 13 (cf. also Hammond-Griffith 10 n. 3: they, too, defend *in Thraciam*, but appear to think that Robert changed this into *in Macedoniam*; the correction was also adopted by e.g. Siegmann 4 n. 4; Austin 11). Schmidt's *in Mygdoniam* (accepted by Rosen 18 n. 83) is less attractive, as this was actually part of Macedonia (cf. *Kl. Pauly* s.v. Makedonia [3, 912]) and Kisseus has no special connection with it.

2 a finitimis oppugnaretur: we may relate this to frs. 229-230 (where see comm.); the motif of hostile neighbours recurs in the stories about Karanos in Syncellus 198 b and Eus. *Chron.* 1, 227 (cf. intr. 2.1).

3 regnum et filiam ... pollicetur: the motif is one that often recurs in folk-literature; cf. Thompson 5, 194f. (nr. Q 112) and 343f. (nr. T 68); some remarks also in Aly 198 and some Homeric examples of the practice to promise daughters as a reward to brave warriors in W. K. Lacey, JHS 86, 1966, 59-61 (cf. also W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece*, London 1968, 39f. + n. 29). The text of Hyginus does not make it clear how much of his kingdom Kisseus actually promised Archelaos (Van Herwerden^2 316 weighs possibilities).

Rosen 18ff. suggests that with the proposed marriage of Archelaos with a Thracian princess Euripides commemorated the tradition of a mixed descendance of the Macedonian dynasty, also reflected in the story of Karanos quarrelling with his wife ("vielleicht die Tochter des Kisseus, die ihm versprochen worden war, wie aus Euripides' *Archelaos* zu entnehmen ist" [20]) about the name of their son (Marsyas *FGrH* 135-6 F 14).

4-5 quia ... fuit: Siegmann 4 n. 3 suggested that this sentence may go back on fr. 2, 18 A (Temenos) Ἡρακλέουc γεγὼc ἄπο, but as both expressions are common, there seems to be little need to connect them so closely. Even so, it is likely that *Herculis filius* goes back on something like Ἡρακλέουc γεγὼc ἄπο or Ἡρακλείδηc in Hyginus' Greek source and must be taken to mean 'descendant of Herakles' rather than 'son' (cf. Rose ad loc. and on *fab.* 3, 3; *ThLL* s.v. *filius* II G [esp. plural]).

6 ab amicis dissuasus: for fragments which have been thought to be from this scene see comm. on frs. 246, 247, 249, 250, 251. As to the nature or motives of these friends we have no clue at all. Klinger 100ff. compares the kind of stories in which a king, who has only a daughter, gets a prophecy about a poor child who will eventually marry his daughter and become his successor; these kings tend to try with all their might to kill these children, but in the end of the prophecies are always fulfilled. This, however, he bases on the idea that Archelaos came as a goatherd (which he infers from test. 8)

and that Kisseus got a prophecy about a goatherd becoming his successor. But (a) Archelaos did not come as a goatherd (see on test. 8), (b) it appears to be an essential part of such stories that the prophecy is fulfilled, whereas in the *Archelaos* this is not the case, (c) it is still not clear where the friends come in. Webster 256 suggested that the friends were in league with the daughter.

7-9 foueam ... decideret: the motif of the pitfall with burning coal at the bottom recalls the story of Ixion, who used it as a means to kill his father-in-law (cf. e.g. Σ A.R. 3, 62 Wendel ἐλθόντοc δὲ ἐπὶ ταῦτα τοῦ Ἠϊονέωc [sc. to collect the dowry], βέρεθρον ποιήcαc καὶ πυρακτώcαc cκεπάζει αὐτὸ λεπτοῖc ξύλοιc καὶ κόνει λεπτῆι. ἐμπεcὼν δὲ ὁ Ἠϊονεὺc ἀπόλλυται); for more examples of this motif as an element in folk-tales see Thompson 4, 413 (nr. K 1601); Aly 223 f.

quo ... decideret: Siegmann 5 n. 6-7 discusses the possible location of the pitfall and argues (a) that although it could be in a spot which Archelaos would be likely to pass frequently after his return, it would be more natural that it was at a point which he would be sure to pass when returning from the battle: an observation which is probably right; because on the one hand it would be most efficient to kill Archelaos immediately after the battle, and on the other hand it would be essential that the fire was still burning when Archelaos fell in, so that it would be a little risky to have the pitfall on a spot which he was not sure to pass as soon as possible. He then argues (b) that the pit must be not far from the palace: "Die Worte: 'regem arreptum' sichern, dass die Unterredung nicht an der Grube selbst zu denken ist, wenn auch in ihrer Nähe. Dann wird es am wahrscheinlichsten, sie an den Palast zu verlegen, weil dann kein Szenenwechsel nötig wird. Der Chor wird mit der Motivierung: 'conloqui velle secreto' von der Bühne entfernt (arbitris semotis)". This too sounds plausible.

Yet, a difficulty remains: one wonders how the idea of a pitfall on Archelaos' way from the battle-field has to fit in with the fact that the slave told Archelaos about it: the slave must have communicated this on the stage, i.e. in front of the palace, which implies that so far at least Archelaos must have returned safely. Now the circumstance that Archelaos could still be warned when near the palace rather suggests that the pitfall was *not* on the way from battle-field to palace-front, but probably at some spot he was sure to pass soon afterwards: perhaps just inside the palace? This would fit in with both Siegmann's observations: he could be made sure to pass the spot (e.g. if Euripides had made him eager to tell his victory to Kisseus, who then would have kept indoors for the occasion) and the later discussion between Archelaos and Kisseus could take place in front of the palace, *regem arreptum* referring to Archelaos dragging Kisseus into the palace towards the pit. This arrangement seems to have the additional advantage that the pitfall (which must of course have been somewhere back-stage, as Kisseus cannot be

expected to have been thrown in in front of the public; cf. Joerden in Jens 402 f. on scenes which usually took place back-stage) was not too far from the place of the quarrel. Archelaos might drag Kisseus across the stage in a comedy, but hardly in a tragedy; a little struggle seems to be all that one may expect (cf. Joerden in Jens 404 n. 34 for some examples; Spitzbarth 35 f.).

10 regis seruus: see intr. 2.2 and intr. to fr. 19 A.

11 arbitris semotis: Rose ad loc. notes that two ways of punctuation are possible, but that most editors prefer to punctuate before *arbitris semotis* (not after it). I think this punctuation must be right, because we do want the information that after Archelaos' request for a private talk (*qui—secreto*) the potential witnesses were indeed removed. If we punctuate after *arbitris semotis* the transition to *Archelaos—perdidit* would be extremely harsh and the sequence of events unneccesarily obscured; besides, the combination *secreto arbitris semotis* would be pleonastic.

As to the question what is actually meant by *arbitris semotis* it is most attractive to take this with Siegmann 5 n. 7 as an indication that the chorus went off-stage for a while and returned again afterwards. For such a μετάςταςις and ἐπιπάροδος of the chorus (cf. Pollux 4, 108 Bethe for the terminology) we have a few parallels from extant plays: (a) going with change of scene: A. *Eu.* 231/244 ff. (search for Orestes), S. *Aj.* 813 f./866 ff. (search for Ajax, who has meanwhile killed himself), (b) without change of scene: *Alc.* 741 ff./861 ff. (funeral procession; cf. Dale on 743: "... since Heracles must make his resolve without witnesses"), *Hel.* 327 ff./515 ff. (wish to accompany Helen into the palace; cf. Kannicht on 327-9 and 385); cf. also *Rhes.* 564/674 ff. (departure of the chorus has also sometimes been claimed for *Phaethon*, but cf. Diggle p. 150). Cf. also Taplin 375 f. It is obvious that in the *Archelaos* too the device would be useful: withdrawal of the chorus would be motivated by the request of Archelaos and dramatically necessary for the killing of Kisseus (it is inconceivable that the planning and execution of this took place in front of his own citizens; some references to similar removals of the victim's attendants in revenge plays in D. Bain, CR 97, 1983, 9; cf. also intr. 2.2); how their return was motivated we do not know, but Siegmann's idea that they came back when they heard the cries of Kisseus (Siegmann 5) is certainly a possibility. It seems likely that between their departure and the appearance of Kisseus Archelaos' resolve to kill the latter was somehow made known to the public—perhaps in a monologue. Cf. *Alc.* 837 ff. where Herakles on an empty stage plans to rescue Alkestis; and on the planning of intrigues against persons who are as yet back-stage in general Joerden in Jens 397 f.; 406 n. 37. To the discussion of Archelaos and Kisseus one may perhaps relate fr. 254, 255 (see comm.).

12 in foueam coniecit: thus Kisseus ended up in his own pitfall; according to Klinger 101 f. this kind of reversal is a typical element in the type of folk-

tales which contain a conflict between 'king' and 'son-in-law/successor' (he gives some parallels); cf. also Thompson 4, 413 (nr. K 1601). For similar reversals cf. also the fate of Dirke as told by e.g. Σ A.R. 4, 1090; Apollod. 3, 5, 5; Hyg. *fab.* 8; Σ *Ph.* 102: Dirke torn to pieces by the bull by which she had meant to kill Antiope; and of Themisto killing her own children instead of Ino's as she had meant to (Hyg. *fab.* 4; but Nauck is doubtful about its relation to Euripides' *Ino* [fr. 398-423]).

13 ex responso Apollinis: this was interpreted by Welcker 2, 708 as referring to the appearance of a prophet or other person who explained an oracle (on the foundation of Aigai) which had been given to Archelaos at an earlier stage, this oracle being a variant of the Pythian oracles to Karanos and Perdikkas (on which see intr. 2.1). Another interpretation, which has found more general acceptance is that the words refer to a *deus ex machina*-scene; so e.g. Hartung 2, 564 (Herakles); Van Herwerden[2] 339, Siegmann 5 + n. 8, Lowicka 270 (all regarding Apollo as the probable *deus*; though Lowicka also considers a prophecy by Teiresias; but see on test. 9). This idea sounds plausible: one can well imagine that the situation had become rather confused after it had been discovered that Archelaos had killed the king (cf. perhaps the reaction of Aigisthos' servants in *El.* 844 ff.). Such a situation could well be sorted out by a *deus ex machina*, who on one hand could calm down those who were angry about what had happened (friends of Kisseus??) and on the other hand could pack off Archelaos to Macedonia with a new and important task, i.e. the foundation of Aigai; on such etymological aitia in the speech of a *deus ex machina* cf. J. R. Wilson, AJPh 89, 1968, 70 + n. 8 (where he mentions the aition from the *Archelaos*). On *deus ex machina*-scenes in general cf. A. Spira, *Untersuchungen zum Deus ex Machina bei Sophokles und Euripides*, Mainz 1960; W. Schmidt, *Der Deus ex Machina bei Euripides*, Diss. Tübingen 1964.

The *responsum* could, with this interpretation, be part of the speech of Apollo *ex machina*. On Apollo in foundation-myths cf. B. Schmid 154 ff.

13-14 capra duce ... Aegeas constituit: it is likely that the play ended shortly after the command to found Aigai, but for 'Hyginus', whose aim it is to give the story of Archelaos it is more apt to finish with the actual *fact* of the foundation; a similar practice can be observed in some of the hypotheses to the preserved plays; cf. e.g. *hyp. Andr.* 14 ff. Θέτιc ... ἐπέταξεν ..., αὐτὸν (sc. Peleus) δὲ ἀθανacίαν προcδέχεcθαι. τυχὼν δὲ αὐτῆc εἰc μακάρων νήcουc ᾤκηcεν: cf. Thetis' promises in *Andr.* 1253 ff.; *hyp. Hel.* 15 f. αὐτοὶ (sc. Helena and Menelaos) δὲ νηὶ ἐμβάντεc ..., εἰc τὴν ἰδίαν διαcώζονται, where the predictions of the Dioskouroi in *Hel.* 1662 ff. are presented as a fact.

capra duce: this suggests that the goat had to lead Archelaos on and then probably stop and lay down at the spot where Aigai had to be founded; cf. the oracles to Kadmos on the foundation of Thebes in nr. 142 P-W ὁ δὲ θεὸc

εἶπεν ... χρῆcθαι ... καθοδηγῶι βοΐ καὶ πόλιν ἐκεῖ κτίζειν, ἔνθα ἂν αὕτη εἰc τὰ δεξιὰ πέcηι καμοῦcα (cf. also nrs. 374, 501; Frazer on Apollod. 3, 4, 1) and to Ilos on the foundation of Ilion (Apollod. 3, 12, 3). On this motif, which appears to be frequent in folktales of various cultures see Thompson 1, 386f. (nr. B 155); A. S. Pease, CPh 12, 1917, 8; B. Schmid 150ff.; Parke-Wormell 1, 310; F. Vian, *Les origines de Thèbes*, Paris 1963, 76ff.; Fontenrose 15f., 74.

The association of goats with Aigai is obviously based on popular etymology, which linked the place-name with αἶγες 'goats'. On the goat motif on Macedonian coins see e.g. Hammond-Griffith 86; 109f.; 138; on coins from Aigai in particular H. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands* III 2 (*Makedonia und Paionia*), Berlin 1935, 18ff. and 62f.

14-15 ab hoc ... dicitur: this of course can have nothing to do with the contents of the *Archelaos*, but the assertion fits in with test. 8 and may show that Euripides' innovation was not entirely forgotten at later times, even though it never became part of the official Macedonian genealogies (cf. the survey in Jacoby's comm. on *FGrH* 115 F 393 [II B 401f.]; Hammond-Griffith 11ff.).

test. 8

If we are right to assume that the story of Archelaos settling in Macedonia was only dealt with in Euripides' *Archelaos*, this passage, too, appears to tell us something about its contents. I think it is good to start with an interpretation of the passage and then see what can be inferred from it: ἢ οὐκ – ποιεῖν; asks Diogenes (5ff.), who is explaining to Alexander that he must first be humble (symbolized by the wearing of a διφθέρα) and sensible, before he can be a good king. The first part of the question ἢ – ἐλαύνων; reminds us of test. 7, 12f. *inde profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce*, though with the difference that in Hyginus Archelaos is not represented as a goatherd, but as led on by a single goat; also in the oracles to Karanos (225, 3ff. P-W) and Perdikkas (226, 4ff. P-W) the founders of Aigai are not goatherds, but are told to found a city on the spot where they *see* goats.

It looks as if Diogenes is here giving a deliberate twist to that story in order to gain his point over the διφθέρα: he first falsely infers from the oracle that Archelaos was a goatherd and then infers from that that he must have worn a διφθέρα, thus supporting his statement that Alexander must do so too. Alexander also realizes that Diogenes' assertion derives from the oracle and tactlessly says so: Τὰ περὶ τὸν χρηcμόν, ὦ Διόγενες, λέγειc ("Oh, you mean the *oracle* ...!"), therewith rejecting the validity of Diogenes' argument, greatly to the annoyance of the latter: ὁ δὲ cτρυφνῶι τῶι προcώπωι, Ποῖον, εἶπε, χρηcμόν; οὐκ οἶδα ἔγωγε, πλὴν ὅτι αἰπόλοc ἦν ὁ Ἀρχέλαοc (admitting defeat by the very stubbornness of his answer!).

With this interpretation it becomes clear that the passage must refer to the latter part of the play (test. 7, 12f. quoted above) and that we cannot infer from it that Archelaos appeared on the stage as a goatherd (mentioned as a possibility by Van Herwerden[2] 317f., after he had first wondered whether the end of the play had somehow induced Dio Chrys. to make Archelaos a goatherd "pour le besoin de la cause" [cf. also comm. on fr. 260]; and by Lowicka 266, who states that from this passage "we may conclude that Archelaus appeared on the stage in the dress of a beggar and in a long speech, recalling the beginning of the *Telephus*, told the history of his family"; and as a certainty by Ridgeway 5; Klinger 100; Dascalakis 133 + n. 104; Stein on Hdt. 8, 137, 2; How-Wells on Hdt. 8, 138 etc.; wrong also Mette[5] 81 "Archelaos treibt auf Grund des Spruches des Apollon als αἰπόλος Ziegen nach Makedonien").

10f. τὰ περὶ τὸν χρηςμόν: this recalls test. 7, 13 *ex responso Apollinis* and seems to refer to the same oracle on the foundation of Aigai; see further on test. 7.

*test. 9

This testimonium is from a passage in which Agatharchides has first heavily criticized the myths about gods and heroes and now goes on to say that one should refrain from blaming poets on this account, because they aim at pleasing their audience rather than at telling the truth (the criticism seems to go back on Eratosthenes, cf. Susemihl in *RE* 6, 1909, 377 [s.v. Eratosthenes]; D. Woelk, *Agatharchides von Knidos, Über das Rote Meer*, Diss. Freiburg 1966, 99).

The lines quoted have been generally regarded as a testimonium of the *Archelaos* and were duly printed at the appropriate place by e.g. Nauck and Austin, but we can no longer be sure about this: now that it has been established that Archelaos was a character not only in the *Archelaos*, but also in *Temenos* and/or *Temenidai* (see app. 2 C 1 and 2) the reference may be to one of those plays just as well as to the *Archelaos*. In fact it is not easy to see how the passage would fit the *Archelaos*: the attempts of Wilamowitz[1] 149 (cf. also Wilamowitz[2] 1, 39 n. 75) and Pohlenz 2, 180, which seem to presuppose that Euripides took the exploits of Temenos, turned them into the exploits of Archelaos and made this the subject of the *Archelaos*, are hard to defend, because the summary in test. 7 does not appear to overlap with anything that has been transmitted of Temenos.

Another suggestion was made by Welcker 2, 702f.: "Euripides gab dem Archelaos wenigstens einen Theil dieser Siege (sc. the victory of Temenos over the Peloponnesians), um dadurch das Vertrauen, das Kisseus in ihn setzte, und vielleicht auch die Vertreibung durch den Neid seiner Brüder zu er-

klären" (cf. also Siegmann 8). In *PHamb.* 118 a, however, Archelaos is born only *after* the return to Argos (cf. fr. 2, 17 ff. A and intr. 1.4), whereas in *PMich.* inv. 1319, which is part of the hypothesis of *Temenos* or *Temenidai* (see app. 2 C 2), Archelaos is excelling in the battle *before* the return to Argos. We may therefore keep Welcker's idea that Agatharchides may refer to this battle, but must reject his suggestion that Archelaos' exploits in this battle were conceived as preceding the events in the *Archelaos.* If this interpretation is right, it seems more likely that Agatharchides refers to *Temenos* or *Temenidai* than to the *Archelaos.* For Euripides' habit of transposing some motif from one person or myth to another cf. in general Stephanopoulos 40 (who gives examples); a very clear example is also the way in which he used motives from the Orestes-myth in his *Kresphontes* (see intr. *Kresphontes* 2.1).

As to the remark on Teiresias, there is no need to assume that this refers to the same play as the remark on Archelaos, nor is it at first sight likely that Teiresias figured in plays which had nothing to do with Thebes (I do not care for the ideas of Klinger 100 and Lowicka 270, who claim Teiresias for the *Archelaos*, among other things warning Kisseus that he might be punished by the gods). It is far more likely that the remark refers to Teiresias' appearance in the Theban plays, where, indeed, we find him as a contemporary of Kadmos (*Ba.* 170 ff.) and still active during the generation of Eteokles and Polyneikes (*Pho.* 834 ff.), i.e. 'six generations later' (Kadmos – Polydoros – Labdakos – Laios – Oidipus – Eteokles); cf. also Welcker 2, 702, who related Agatharchides' criticism to the *Bacchae.* On the long life of Teiresias cf. e.g. Hes. fr. 276 (seven generations) and in general Buslepp in Roscher 5, 180 (s.v. Teiresias).

fr. 228 + *PHamb.* 118a = fr. 1-2 A

We have two fragments of the prologue of the *Archelaos*: fr. 228 (on the rivalry between fr. 228 and 846 see intr. to fr. 228) and fr. 2 A (= *PHamb.* 118 a). Thanks to fr. 2 A we can now be certain that the speaker of the prologue rhesis was Archelaos himself (on the rareness of protagonists speaking the prologue rhesis in Euripides see intr. to *Kresph.* fr. 66, 1-12 A): 19 ff. show that the speaker is a son of Temenos; in 25 Temenos is ordered to call his future son Archelaos. Admittedly it is not said explicitly that the speaker and this son-to-be are the *same* son of Temenos, but it is very unlikely that one of the other sons of Temenos (who drove Archelaos into exile) would speak the prologue rhesis of the *Archelaos.* Cf. Siegmann 6; Webster 255. The earlier view that the prologue rhesis was spoken by Herakles (cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 700; Van Herwerden[2] 325) can now be discarded. Considering the summary of the play in test. 7 it seems a likely guess that Archelaos spoke this rhesis after his arrival in Thrace, standing probably in front of the palace of

Kisseus. The start *ex abrupto* (see comm. on fr. 228, 1) makes it almost certain that Archelaos was alone (like most prologue speakers in Euripides).

Both fragments form part of a long genealogy, ranging from Danaos to Archelaos himself. It is well known that Euripides, especially in his later plays, was very fond of inserting genealogies into his prologue speeches. Cf. Méridier 54 ff.; M. Treu, *Wohl dem der seiner Väter gern gedenkt. Die Interpretierbarkeit genealogischer Reihen bei Euripides*, Gymn. 75, 1968, 435-452; H. Strohm, Grazer Beitr. 6, 1977, 129 f. (on the genealogy in *HF* 1 ff.); for a discussion of such 'impersonal' beginnings cf. also Ludwig 31 ff. We find this habit criticized in Ar. *Ra.* 945 ff. (Ar. *Ach.* 47 ff. [the genealogy of Amphitheos] has been regarded as a parody of Euripidean genealogies, but this is denied by Rau 186). Here the genealogy is uncommonly long: to start with Danaos means going back into the past very far indeed (11 generations), much further actually than any of the other genealogies we have. If we compare the genealogies in the prologues of *HF*, *Ion*, *IT*, *Ph.*, *Or.* and *Hel.* 386 ff. the longest is *Or.* 4 ff. with five generations (and this is surpassed by none of the fragments which contain parts of genealogies either).

A long genealogy like this is apt to make the prologue look very 'undramatic' and this impression is still increased because we find no first pers. sg. or references to the speaker himself before fr. 2, 19 A, i.e. not within the first ca. 30 lines (that is, if we are right in assuming that no such element was contained in the lines which are lost between the two fragments). Nor are there any references to the place where the play is set (*El.* 1 ff. is comparable inasmuch as the farmer does not come in before 34, but the speech is different in that it gives information on the place of action [Argos, addressed in 1] and actual circumstances).

All this can probably be explained by the special purpose of the play: (1) as it was probably designed with the intention to celebrate the Greek ancestry of the Macedonian king Archelaos, an elaborate genealogy starting from the legendary king of Argos, Danaos, is very suitable, (2) performance in Macedonia might require a more explicit treatment of mythological details than performance in Athens (cf. Siegmann 7), (3) Siegmann 6 f. also argues: "Die breite Vorführung des Stammbaums ist wie im Ion nicht nur in der üblichen euripideischen Gepflogenheit begründet, sondern hat den besonderen Zweck, eine mythologische Erfindung, die sich aus einer aktuellen Situation ergab, in extenso vorzuführen und dadurch zu betonen". Certainly, if Archelaos was 'invented' by Euripides (see intr. 2.1), this genealogy could help to settle him firmly among the descendants of Danaos (cf. the way in which genealogical details are used in *Hel.* 4 ff. and *HF* 26 ff. in order to establish obscure mythological characters). Still, the demands of (2) and (3) could be met without going into all these details about Archelaos' ancestry, so I tend to think that (1) was the most important reason for inserting this long genealogy.

The first part of the genealogy, from Danaos up to Hyllos was well established long before the *Archelaos* was written. Parts of it in e.g. Hes. fr. 129 and 135; Pi. *N.* 10, 1-6; B. 11, 40ff.; Hdt. 2, 91, 5; cf. Kuhnert in Roscher III 2, 2022, 42ff. (s.v. Perseus). In fr. 2, 17ff. A we come across two things which are not earlier attested: (1) Temenos as a son of Hyllos (see comm. ad loc.), (2) Archelaos as a son of Temenos (see intr. 2.1).

How the prologue went on after Archelaos' speech is still a matter of conjecture. If fr. 229, in which Kisseus is addressed, is the beginning of the parodos (Siegmann 8 regards this as certain, but see my comm. ad loc.), Kisseus must have appeared on stage before the parodos. If so, a prologue of two scenes seems a possibility: (1) a rhesis of Archelaos, (2) a scene between either Archelaos and Kisseus or Kisseus and somebody else. It is likely that in this second scene the situation in Thrace was explained (which would subsequently be amplified in the parodos, cf. A. *Th.* 78ff.). Siegmann 9 suggests that Kisseus explained this situation either alone or with a friend, after Archelaos had disappeared at the end of his speech. He admits that Archelaos' departure would be more difficult to account for than those of the prologue speakers in *El.* and *IT*, because Archelaos is a stranger who has only just arrived, but he finds other reconstructions even more problematic (cf. Siegmann 9 n. 24: [1] Archelaos asks Kisseus to come out: this would imply the presence of e.g. a porter during the prologue speech and the repetition of much that was said in the prologue speech, [2] Archelaos went in to tell Kisseus of his arrival; then Kisseus came out with a friend and told him about the discussion with Archelaos: no way to fill in the gap between Archelaos' going in and Kisseus' coming out, as we are still before the parodos). Still, I think that Kisseus' explanations about the situation in Thrace would come most naturally if they were given to a stranger, i.c. Archelaos, who had just arrived and naturally was curious to know all about it. A dialogue between Archelaos and Kisseus would also have the advantage of getting the play going. Siegmann's objection that such a meeting requires a porter to fetch Kisseus is not very substantial: he may have come out for some reason of his own or just arrived from somewhere else. However, the location of fr. 229 remains an uncertain factor.

For a survey of the structures of the prologues of the preserved plays, cf. Nestle[2] 82ff., H. W. Schmidt in Jens 3ff. This will show that the structures discussed above do not exhaust the possibilities.

fr. 228 = 1 A

From Plu. *X Orat. Vitae* 837 e it is clear that fr. 228 is the beginning of a play, and it is elsewhere established that the fragment is from the *Archelaos* (see app. crit.; also Tzetzes' τις ἀνὴρ Ἀρχέλαος is probably best interpreted as a mistake resulting from the fact that the Nile floods were mentioned in the

Archelaos [and *by* Archelaos in the prologue!]; the rather vague τις ἀνὴρ seems to exclude the philosopher Archelaos [2, 44ff. D-K]). The obvious conclusion is therefore that fr. 228 is the beginning of the *Archelaos*. However, according to a scholion on Ar. *Ra.* 1206ff. 'some people' thought that the beginning of the *Archelaos* was Ar. *Ra.* 1206ff. = fr. inc. 846 Αἴγυπτος, ὡς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος, / ξὺν παισὶ πεντήκοντα ναυτίλωι πλάτηι / Ἄργος κατασχών. The relevant scholion goes as follows: Ἀρχελάου αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρχή, ὥς τινες ψευδῶς. οὐ γὰρ φέρεται νῦν Εὐριπίδου λόγος οὐδεὶς τοιοῦτος. οὐ γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος, τοῦ Ἀρχελάου, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς μετέθηκεν ὕστερον, ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κείμενον εἶπεν (307, 26ff. Dübner; cf. J. Schuringa, *Scholia Vetera ad Aristophanis Ranas codicis Ven. Marc. 474*, Groningen/Batavia 1945, 180f.; perhaps it is better to insert ⟨οὐκ⟩ before Ἀρχελάου [so A. Römer, RhM 63, 1908, 356] or ⟨οὐχ⟩ before αὕτη [so R. Schnee, *Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Aristophanes Scholien*, Berlin 1872 on Σ *Ra.* 1237; prob. Holzinger, ZöG 31, 1880, 598]). Here the idea that fr. 846 should be the beginning of the *Archelaos* is rejected for two reasons: (1) no such lines are transmitted from Euripides, (2) Aristarchus says it is not from the *Archelaos*, unless Euripides later changed the beginning and Aristophanes here quotes the original beginning (the syntax is against taking the last part to mean 'but Aristophanes [of Byzantium] said that it was the [original] beginning', as did e.g. Th. Bergk, *Comm. de reliquiis com. att. ant.*, Lipsiae 1838, 95; Mette[5] 83).

This testimonium caused Nauck (on fr. 846) to believe that there must have been either two different beginnings of the *Archelaos*, or those people who said that Ar. *Ra.* 1206ff. was the real beginning must have been mistaken. The first idea was suggested by Valckenaer 162: "huius quoque tragoediae duplex fuisse videbitur recensio" and was taken over by e.g. Welcker 2, 700f. n. 3; Koster[2] 88-90; and — with the addition that the first version was written in Athens and then reworked for use in Macedonia — Bergk o.c. 95f.; A. Römer, RhM 63, 1908, 356; and recently by M. van der Valk, in *ACTUS. Studies in Honour of H. L. W. Nelson* (ed. J. den Boeft and A. H. M. Kessels), Utrecht 1982, 418f., who gives as a reason for the revision of the prologue that Euripides, when in Macedonia, may have wanted to let the genealogy begin with Danaos instead of Aigyptos in order to make it more flattering for the king.

On the whole this theory has little to recommend it: if Euripides made both versions in Macedonia it is hard to see why one of them was sent down to Athens and parodied in Ar. *Ra.* very soon afterwards (405 B.C.); if he made one version of the *Archelaos* while still in Athens it is hard to explain the remark in test. 1 which says that he wrote the play as a favour to Archelaos when he had come to Macedonia (cf. Welcker 2, 700f. n. 3).

Koster[2] 88-90 tried to explain the 'revision' by pointing to the similarities

between fr. 228, 6 and 846, 3, which he supplied with ᾤικις' Ἰνάχου πόλιν, from an unpublished scholion on Ar. *Ra.* 1208 in *Paris. Gr.* 2822 (late XV A.D.) (I think this supplement is rather due to a clever scholiast, who knew fr. 228, especially because the scholion contains the same error as the mss. of Tiberius and Strabo [ᾤικηϲεν; but Koster 89 n. 2 rejects this argument]—and surely it seems not very likely that we should find Aigyptos called the founder of Argos; also it would be unlikely that this version of a fragment which was no longer known in Alexandria was known to this one scholiast [for a similar argument, though linked with his theory of two versions of the prologue cf. Van der Valk o.c. 419]). Koster (89 n. 3) then suggested that fr. 228, 6 is an improvement of fr. 846, 3, where he found Ἄργοϲ καταϲχών unusual for tragedy; but if we regard Argos as 'Argolis' here (see comm. on fr. 2, 13-14 A), we can compare *Cyc.* 223 κατέϲχον ... χθόνα and *Hel.* 1206 κατέϲχε γῆν (where see Kannicht) and find that the expression, though more specific here, is conceivable.

The second solution mentioned by Nauck seems far more likely. Certainly the similarity between both fragments (a father taking his fifty children to Argos) is big enough to explain why they got confused. We have a similar case in fr. inc. 888 βέβληκ' Ἀχιλλεὺϲ δύο κύβω καὶ τέϲϲαρα for which Σ Ar. *Ra.* 1400 mention as possible candidates the *Telephos*, *Philoktetes* and *IA* and A. *Myrmidones*: Nauck ad loc. remarks that the scholiast thought of *IA* probably because he vaguely remembered *IA* 192 ff. For a possible way in which such a confusion could arise cf. Van Leeuwen, intr. to Ar. *Ra.* p. XI. If there was a mistake, fr. 846 must belong to another prologue of Euripides, and if we believe Aristarchus as quoted in the scholion on Ar. *Ra.* 1206, this prologue or the whole play to which it belonged must have been lost before the time of Aristarchus. For a discussion on the number of plays which were already lost by that time see Schmid *GGL* I 3, 329 f. Van Herwerden[2] 323 suggests that the play in question was the *Danae*; one could also think of *Diktys*; *Temenos* and *Temenidai* are excluded because of *POxy.* 27, 2455 frs. 8 and 11.

On the whole fr. 228 as the 'real' beginning fits in best with the evidence: (1) the ancient testimonia favour it (see the app.), (2) it fits in with the judgment of Aristarchus as quoted in the scholion. To this we may add (3) that Danaos, who founded Argos and had the inhabitants called after him, is the appropriate ancestor to start with if you want to celebrate a Macedonian king with claims to Greek ancestry (far more appropriate in any case than Aigyptos; cf. also Pohlenz 2, 180); also the sequence 'flight—arrival in a new country—foundation of a new town' suggests a parallel in the careers of Danaos and his descendant Archelaos (cf. also Stoessl[1] 67 = id.[2] 2341), (4) that it is unlikely that Aristophanes parodied in the *Frogs* of 405 a play of 408-7 which was not even performed in Athens, but far off in

Macedonia (on the average lapse of time between original and parody in general see intr. to *Kresph.* 1.1).

Still it may be worth noticing a third solution of the problem, offered by Page 93, who regarded fr. 228 as an actor's interpolation, arguing that "Aristophanes the comedian evidently read them (sc. the lines of fr. 846) in the prologue". Of course the quotation of fr. 846 in *Ra.* 1206 ff. only proves that it was from an Euripidean prologue, not that it was from the prologue of the *Archelaos*, so that Page's argument really falls flat. Yet there are a few things in fr. 228 which make one understand why it could be regarded as spurious: the long expansion on the water of the Nile, which has no function here (for contrast cf. *Hel.* 1-3), really breaks the back of the first sentence, the whole structure being especially clumsy because of the gen. abs. in 5 (which is of doubtful contents at that, see comm. ad loc.); in 3 the gen. in -οιο in iambic trimeters is unparalleled and seems suspicious (see comm.); perhaps we should also mention 5 τεθριππεύοντος, but such a gross fault against metre may be more likely to be a corruption than a sign of interpolation.

As the oddities are all concentrated in 3-5, I think one should not go as far as Page (thus defying all the other evidence, except for that of the obscure τινες in the scholion), but would rather be inclined to regard 3-5 as an interpolation. Cf. Dale, intr. *Hel.* XXXII "... what should be decisive [sc. in cases where suspicion of interpolation arises] is the *combination* of clumsy expression or doubtful grammar or limping metre with expendability in sense, especially where the join-up after excision is neat or even restores a lost train of thought". This description seems to fit our lines about the Nile remarkably well! (For lit. on interpolations see further Collard, intr. *Su.* p. 44 n. 176). If the lines are an interpolation, it must have been quite old, as it seems likely that the Anon. and the tragic quotations therein go back on Aristotle's treatise on the Nile (frs. 246-8 Rose) (cf. Kannicht, intr. *Hel.* p. 86), but that is conceivable. It would certainly make the fragment far more palatable if we could read it without 3-5. (Somewhat comparable interpolations in prologues are *Tr.* 13-14, cf. J. R. Wilson, AJPh 89, 1968, 66-71; *Ph.* 1-2, cf. M. W. Haslam GRBS 16, 1975, 149-174 and *POxy.* 47, 3321 and 3322).

PHamb. 118 a offers no help at all in these matters: col. I 15, which might be part of the first line of the *Archelaos* (but see intr. to *PHamb.* 118 a) ends with traces which exclude neither of the beginnings recorded for the *Archelaos* (cf. intr. 3.1).

A fourth solution was offered by Stoessl[1] 64 ff. ≅ id.[2] 2340, who wanted to have both fragments in the prologue: first fr. 228, then some lines on the sons of Aigyptos and the flight of the Danaids, then fr. 846; this idea was approved by Lowicka 265. But fr. 846 clearly has the structure of a *beginning*; also the lack of a connecting particle and the similarity to fr. 228 make this solution very unattractive; cf. also Page 93; Van der Valk o.c. 418.

1 Archelaos begins his speech *ex abrupto* with the genealogy. For similar beginnings cf. *Ion*, *IT* and Agamemnon's speech in *IA* 49 ff.; among the lost plays cf. *Mel. Sophe* (Page *GLP* 1, 118), *Hypsipyle* (fr. 752), *Phrixus II* (fr. 819) and fr. inc. 846. On Ar.'s criticism of the monotony of these beginnings cf. Méridier 132 ff.; for some recent views on the lekythion-joke cf. Z. P. Ambrose, AJPh 89, 1968, 342-5; C. H. Whitman, HSPh 73, 1969, 109-12; J. Henderson, HSPh 76, 1972, 133-44; B. Snell, Hermes 107, 1979, 129-33. It was of course appropriate to start a genealogy which was meant to celebrate the Greek ancestry of the Macedonian king Archelaos with Danaos, the founder of Argos and heros eponymos of the Danaoi.

Δαναὸϲ ὁ ...: for the way in which the name is immediately followed by a further description cf. *Ion* 1 and *IT* 1. On Eur. plays starting with a proper name cf. Bond on *Hyps.* fr. 752. This line is one of the six lines in the fragments of the *Archelaos* which have two resolutions (the others are fr. 248, 1; 255, 5; 257, 2; and 2, 9 and 11 A). Cf. Zielinski 221 "quae frequentia (i.e. 4:69 for him, 6:90 for us) ipsa quoque liberrimi stili indicium est"; Snell[2] 20. Even though one must be cautious in using such evidence to date a play when one is dealing with fragments, it should be noted that this frequency suits the date of the *Archelaos* as we know it from other evidence.

2 Νείλου ... κάλλιϲτον ... ὕδωρ: 'the most beautiful waters of the Nile' is a poetic description of Egypt. Cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1-3, who explains: "denn es ist zugleich eine typisch griechische Vorstellung, dass die Flüsse die Ernährer der Länder sind und deshalb als deren Repräsentanten gedacht werden können". In a similar way Troy is represented by the Skamander and Simoeis, Thebes by the Dirke and Ismenos (e.g. *Ba.* 5 πάρειμι Δίρκηϲ νάματ' Ἰϲμηνοῦ θ'ὕδωρ), Argos by the Inachos (e.g. *Ph.* 574 and cf. on 6 below), Sparta by the Eurotas (e.g. *Hel.* 124). For Egypt represented by the Nile cf. also *Hel.* 89, 462, 491, 671; more examples in Kannicht on *Hel.* 1-3; examples from Latin literature in Postl 215 ff. One might also compare those passages where the name of the river or fountain follows the name of the town or country, either in apposition (e.g. *Il.* 2, 659) or connected with τε (e.g. Sappho fr. 44, 6 L-P, on which see E.-M. Voigt, Hermes 89, 1961, 251-3, who also gives more examples from Homer, all from contexts about bringing somebody/something or coming from a distant place).

λιπὼν: cf. for this structure the beginning of *Phrixos II* fr. 819, 1 f. Ϲιδώνιόν ποτ' ἄϲτυ Κάδμοϲ ἐκλιπών, / Ἀγήνοροϲ παῖϲ, ἦλθε Θηβαίαν χθόνα, cf. also *Ph.* 5 f. In our fragment however the part. is subordinate to another part. ἐλθὼν in 6; cf. KG 2, 104; Schwyzer 2, 406.

†ἐκ γαίηϲ†: none of the transmitted readings seems to make sense. Several solutions of the problem have therefore been attempted, which can be roughly divided into two groups:

(1) something going with λιπὼν: 'why or how did Danaos leave Egypt?'

The description of the circumstances of his departure in Apollod. 2, 1, 4 cταcιαcάντων δὲ αὐτῶν (sc. Danaos and Aigyptos) περὶ τῆc ἀρχῆc ὕcτερον, Δαναὸc τοὺc Αἰγύπτου παῖδαc δεδοικώc, ὑποθεμένηc Ἀθηνᾶc αὐτῶι ναῦν κατεcκεύαcε πρῶτοc καὶ τὰc θυγατέραc ἐνθέμενοc ἔφυγε suggests several possibilities, e.g. a reference to the quarrel with Aigyptos, to the invention of the ship, to the daughters accompanying Danaos etc. Such a reference could be effected either by an adj. used adverbially (like Van Herwerden's εὐcταλῆc, which, however, does not give the required meaning; cf. A. *Pers*. 795, S. *Ph*. 780) or an adverb or a prepositional construction: so Hartung's εὐκταίωc, which was revived by Ballaira, who argued that ἐκ γαίηc could be caused by misreading εὐκταίηc: τ read as γ, after which the change from εὐκ- to ἐκ- seemed inevitable—if so, εὐκταίηc would be more likely to reflect something of the original text than ἐκ γαίηc (cf. Ballaira 64; differently West 71). But this must be rejected because (a) the word does not make sense here: according to Ballaira it must mean 'with prayers for a safe journey', but εὐκταῖοc (which is found thrice in Euripides: *Med*. 169, *IT* 213, *Or*. 214) is always passive, and I cannot see how εὐκταίωc could ever bear the active meaning which Ballaira favours (not even in his main parallel Jos. *BJ* 7, 22 —quoted by Ballaira 65 n. 9—need it be used in an active sense); (b) the way in which Ballaira explains the corruption of εὐκταίωc into εὐκταίηc is unsatisfactory: he explains it as being caused by a mistake of the scribe of *V* of Tiberius, who read the abbreviation for -ωc as -ηc, but apart from the fact that "abbreviations are not actually misread as often as some ingenious emenders think" (M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973, 28), this does not account for the corruption in the mss. of D.S. and the Anonymus. Another emendation in this group is Schmidt's ἐκ χρείαc, on which he argues: "Da die Sage den Danaos aus seiner Heimat notgedrungen scheiden lässt, so bietet sich, sollte ich meinen, von selbst Νείλου λιπὼν κάλλιcτον ἐκ χρείαc ὕδωρ, was ebenso gutes Griechisch ist wie ἐξ ἀνάγκηc (Soph. *Ph*. 73, Plat. *Phaedr*. p. 246 a). Ähnlich heisst es vom Kadmos fr. 816, 5 [= fr. 819, 5 N^2] ἧι δ'ἦλθ' ἀνάγκηι πεδία Φοινίκηc λιπών, λέγοιμ'ἄν" (for ἐξ ἀνάγκηc cf. also *Or*. 488). Schmidt's line of thought may be in the right direction, but it seems unlikely that ἐκ χρείαc is what we want here: χρεία is basically 'need, want' (cf. LSJ s.v. χρεία I), rather than the sort of force which drove Danaos out of Egypt;

(2) part of the qualification of the Nile: none of the conjectures made in this respect I find convincing, nor can I accept interpretations like Wagner's, which keep ἐκ γαίαc (ἐκ γαίηc is not attested in tragedy): "relicta pulcherrima, quae ex terra profluit, aqua" (Wagner 672). That a prepositional phrase is thus used is not uncommon (cf. e.g. *Su*. 206 ὡc τά τ'ἐκ γαίαc τρέφηι, i.e. the things that grow from the earth), but it is very hard to see how this could be connected with the explanation of the Nile-floods in 3-5.

Besides, εὐκταίηc is then very difficult to explain (though it may be due to misreading ἐκ γαίηc). Only if my suspicion that 3-5 are an interpolation is right, ἐκ γαίαc might be defended as reflecting another theory about the Nile-floods, i.e. the theory that the water came out of the earth. This theory, which is well attested in Egyptian texts of all periods (cf. S. Sauneron, BIAO 51, 1952, 41 + 42 n. 1; Bonneau 171 f.), had also found defendants among Greek philosophers of V B.C. (for a survey cf. Bonneau 171-186; Postl 58-65), so that it is perhaps conceivable that we should find it alluded to in tragedy; it should be noted that there is a reminiscence of one of these philosophers also in *Tr.* 884 ff.: cf. Diogenes of Apollonia 64 C 2 (2, 67, 12 ff. D-K). For another attempt to defend ἐκ γαίαc cf. Matthiae 9, 85.

Considering both (1) and (2) I think that both have points in their favour: in defence of (1) one could argue that the Nile has been well qualified already, whereas we do not know any particulars about Danaos' departure yet; in favour of (2) it may be said that the position of †ἐκ γαίηc† rather suggests that it goes with κάλλιcτον ... ὕδωρ (although hyperbaton 12345 is also conceivable, cf. e.g. *Hel.* 113). A reason for not giving up ἐκ γαίαc vel sim. too soon may be that, in combination with κάλλιcτον ... ὕδωρ it suggests a reminiscence of such lines as *Il.* 2, 850 Ἀξιοῦ, οὗ κάλλιcτον ὕδωρ ἐπικίδναται αἶαν, 21, 158 Ἀξιοῦ, ὃc κάλλιcτον ὕδωρ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἵηcιν, cf. also *Od.* 11, 238 f.

κάλλιcτον: for praise of the Nile in later Greek and Latin literature in comparison with other rivers see Postl 211 ff.

3 **μελαμβρότοιο γῆc:** 'land of negroes' (LSJ). Apart from here the word is attested only in *Phaeth.* 4 γείτονεc μελάμβροτοι, where it must mean 'black' and refers to the Aithiopians (cf. Diggle ad loc.) and Q.S. 2, 31 f. ἀπερείcια φῦλα / λαῶν, οἳ ναίουcι μελάμβροτον Αἰθιόπειαν, with the same meaning as here. The blackness of the Aithiopians is also mentioned several times by A., cf. e.g. *Pr.* 808, κελαινὸν φῦλον, 851; *Suppl.* 154 f., 719 f.; fr. 370, and was apparently one of their most striking characteristics. Cf. F. M. Snowden Jr., *Blacks in Antiquity*, Cambridge Mass. 1970, 2 ff. + notes. On E.'s preference for compound adj. of this type cf. Breitenbach 61 ff.

The gen. in -οιο we find only here in iambic trimeters and in an (impossible) variant mentioned in Σ *Ph.* 174 φιλαιμάτοιο. In lyrical passages we find it more often, e.g. *Hipp.* 560 διγόνοιο, *HF* 123 τροχηλάτοιο; for more examples cf. Page on *Med.* 135. In A. there are also a few instances of this gen. in lyrics: certain only *Pers.* 109 εὐρυπόροιο θαλάccαc (obviously a Homeric reminiscence); further: *Pers.* 568 πρωτομόροιο (Blomfield), 865 ποταμοῖο (Burney). In S. it is not attested; Page points to *Ant.* 100 (ἀελίοιο L^c *A rec.*, but this is excluded by the metre of the antistrophe), *Aj.* 210 (Φρυγίοιο coni. J. Jaeger and this was accepted in Dawe's text; contra: P. Maas, *Kleine Schriften*, München 1973, 229 n. 2) and fr. 142 col. II 1

Pearson ζεφύρ[ο]ιο, but this has since turned out to be part of E. *Telephos* (fr. 149, 1 A), cf. E. W. Handley - J. R. Rea, *The Telephus of Euripides* (BICS Suppl. 5), London 1957, 11 ff.

It is therefore rather surprising to find this gen. here in iambic trimeters and I think it may well make us suspicious about the text. Wilamowitz on *HF* 121 tries to explain it: "Der epische (fälschlich sog. thessalische) Genetiv ist nach dem Vorgang von Epos und Lyrik in Chören durchaus zulässig. Am Ende seines Lebens hat Eur., aber er allein, ihn einzeln auch im Dialog verwandt, Archel. 228". Other instances of the phenomenon may have occurred in the lost plays, but its absence from *Or.*, *Ba.* and *IA* is suspicious. Yet one may adduce an instance of a similar anomalous form in *Alc.* 756 (χείρεϲϲι in dialogue); cf. Dale ad loc. and Dodds on *Ba.* 76. No firm decision seems possible.

ῥοάϲ: usually connected with a gen. or adj. indicating a river or other liquid (cf. LSJ s.v.). An exception in E. is *IT* 258 f. οὐδέ πω βωμὸϲ θεᾶϲ / Ἑλληνικαῖϲιν ἐξεφοινίχθη ῥοαῖϲ (del. Nauck, and after him Diggle), where the idea of 'blood' can be supplied from the context. In our passage we have to supply 'his' from the preceding line. The acc. is a little difficult to explain, although the sense is clear: πληροῦται could be med. or pass. (elsewhere it is always pass. in Euripides) and the acc. could be a cognate acc. or a so-called 'obiectum effectum' (cf. Schwyzer 2, 71 ff.). I could find no close parallels for such an acc. with πληροῦται, but one might compare e.g. Pi. *N.* 10, 75 θερμὰ δὴ τέγγων δάκρυα; S. *Aj.* 376 ἐρεμνὸν αἷμ' ἔδευϲα, although here as well as in the other examples mentioned in KG 1, 308 f. the acc. is usually accompanied by an adj. or pronoun. The alternative, however, would be to take ῥοάϲ as either an acc. resp. or as direct obj. of med. πληροῦται and that is not very attractive, as it is hard to see how a river can be said to 'fill his streams', the streams being the river.

ἐκ ... πληροῦται: the expression is somewhat elliptical. What is meant is of course: 'he is filled ... ⟨with water⟩ from Aithiopia'. Cf. e.g. *Od.* 10, 361 λό' ἐκ τρίποδοϲ μεγάλοιο ("diesem das warme Wasser entnehmend" Ameis-Hentze ad loc.) and Pl. *Phdr.* 235 c λείπεται δὴ οἶμαι ἐξ ἀλλοτρίων ποθὲν ναμάτων διὰ τῆϲ ἀκοῆϲ πεπληρῶϲθαί με δίκην ἀγγείου.

4 Αἰθιοπίδοϲ γῆϲ: cf. A. fr. inc. 300, 2 Αἰθιοπίδοϲ γῆϲ, also in a fragment about the Nile-floods.

ἡνίκ' ἂν τακῆι χιών: for references in tragedy to the theory that the melting of the snow caused the Nile-floods cf. *Hel.* 1-3 Νείλου μὲν αἵδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί, / ὃϲ ἀντὶ δίαϲ ψακάδοϲ Αἰγύπτου πέδον / λευκῆϲ τακείϲηϲ χιόνοϲ ὑγραίνει γύαϲ; A. fr. inc. 300; *Suppl.* 559, S. F 882. As it was well-known that it never rained in Egypt (cf. e.g. the allusions in *Alc.* 115 f., *El.* 734 ff., *Ba.* 406 ff. and the story in Hdt. 3, 10, 3), other explanations of the Nile-floods were sought. One of those was the idea that they were caused by

the melting of the snow in Aithiopia (a theory which was rejected by Hdt. 2, 22).

This theory was attributed to Anaxagoras (so e.g. the Anon. de Nilo *FGrH* 647 F 1, 2; D.S. 1, 38, 4; Sen. *NQ* 4, 2, 17; Joh. Lyd. *de Mens.* 4, 107; on the ancient discussions of this theory see further Postl 54 ff.; W. Capelle, *Die Nilschwelle*, NJb 33, 1914, 317-361; Bonneau 161-169). For reasons to doubt the attribution of the theory to Anaxagoras see Kannicht on *Hel.* 1-3 (p. 16): if Anaxagoras came to Athens only ca. 460 B.C. A. *Suppl.* 559 f. cannot be dependent on him; cf. also Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Suppl.* 559. On the Nile-floods as a literary theme cf. S. Sauneron, *Un thème littéraire de l'antiquité classique: le Nil et la pluie*, BIAO 51, 1952, 41-48.

5 τέθριππ'ἄγοντος: three ms.-readings are now available, but none of them can be defended on good grounds:

(1) τεθριππεύοντος: if 3-5 are from E., τεθριππεύοντος must be corrected *metri causa*: correption of -ευ- before a vowel within a word is not elsewhere found in tragedy, although -οι- and -αι- may occasionally be correpted (cf. Koster[1] 34 f. [examples on p. 35 n. 1]; Collard on *Su.* 42-44); -ευ- we find correpted sometimes in the iambics of Hipponax, but apparently not elsewhere (cf. Koster[1] 35 n. 1). If the lines are from an interpolator, we cannot be sure that τεθριππεύοντος was not what he meant.

(2) τεθρίππου ὄντος: this is obviously intractable.

(3) τέθριππ'ἰόντος: this reading appeared in the recently published part of Tzetzes' *Exegesis in Iliadem* (full references in app. crit.) and our only testimony for it is the *Cod. Cantabrig. Gr.* (Coll. Trin.) R.16.33 (S. XIV/XV). Whether this late ms. presents a real variant or just an early attempt to emend one of the other two readings, is a matter which is now impossible to decide. In any case Papathomopoulos' defence of this reading cannot stand: he compares the use of the neuter pl. in such expressions as S. *OT* 883 ὑπέροπτα ... πορεύεται, *OC* 1695 f. οὔ τοι κατάμεμπτ' ἔβητον, E. *Hel.* 283 πολιὰ παρθενεύεται (where see Kannicht, who explains these neuters as really cognate acc.). But in all these examples the adj. indicates an abstract quality, not a concrete object as in our passage (cf. also G. L. Koniaris, AJPh 103, 1982, 114 "by definition, internal object cannot carry such 'on'/'by' relations"). Papathomopoulos himself is also aware of this difficulty and adduces Anacreon *PMG* 452 κόρωνα (v. l. -νά) βαίνων (v. l. φαίνων) as a possible 'concrete' parallel. But it may be better (in spite of the lemma κορώνη in *Et. Gud.* 339, 22) to keep the accentuation κορωνά and take the expression in Anacreon with LSJ s.v. κορωνός II as equivalent to κορωνιάω 'arch the neck' (of a horse): τὰ κόρωνα, which would have to mean 'elbows' (LSJ s.v. κορωνόν 2), is only attested in late prose, and it is hard to grasp the sense of 'going on one's elbows'. So, in conclusion, I cannot believe that τέθριππ'ἰόντος is right (similarly West 71 and id. apud Papathomopoulos 40; J. Diggle, CR 32, 1982, 90; Koniaris, o.c. 113 f.).

As to the conjectures which have been proposed here, F. W. Schmidt's solution, which was taken over by Nauck and Austin, is of all the attempts certainly the most attractive; cf. *Andr.* 277 f. τρίπωλον ἅρμα δαιμόνων / ἄγων τὸ καλλιζυγές (F. W. Schmidt 2, 454 gives a few more parallels). The most recent attempts, i.e. Papathomopoulos' τέθριππ' ἰέντος and West's τέρθριον ἰόντος have nothing to recommend them. West's argumentation actually rather puzzles me: he remarks "I expect 'as the sun moves in the southernmost part of the sky' and I conjecture τέρθριον ἰόντος" (West apud Papathomopoulos 40; similarly West 71). Now τέρθριος according to LSJ s.v. is '*rope from the end of a sail-yard* (τέρθρον), used for reefing' and it is perhaps conceivable that it is used in an adjectival sense (cf. S. F 333 τερθρία πνοή?) to indicate some extremity (cf. LSJ s.v. τέρθρον II and e.g. fr. 371). But it was in the winter that the sun could be said to be "in the southernmost part of the sky", whereas the Nile-floods took place in the summer. I think this is fatal to West's idea (West 71 shows himself aware of, but not defeated by, this difficulty). Both conjectures are also rejected by Diggle l.c.

The chariot of Helios is not yet found in Homer, but afterwards we find many allusions to Helios driving a chariot. Cf. *hCer.* 88 f., Hes. fr. 390 M-W (perhaps), Mimn. fr. 12 W, A. fr. 192, S. *Aj.* 845 f. and for more examples Diggle on *Phaeth.* 2. In E. cf. e.g. *Ion* 41 κυρεῖ δ' ἅμ'ἱππεύοντος ἡλίου κύκλωι (very similar to our line), 82 f., *Hel.* 342 τέθριππά θ'ἁλίου, *Ph.* 1562 f. τέθριππά γ'ἔθ'ἅρματα λεύςςων / ἀελίου, *El.* 866, *IA* 156-9; in all these examples from E. the expression indicates the 'day-light' (as opposed to the night), and not 'summer', which is what it would have to mean in our fragment, as the Nile-floods took place in the summer. And, indeed, as Helios made his trip every day the expression is not suitable for indicating the idea of 'summer'. This, in combination with the awkward gen. abs.-construction and perhaps the word τεθριππεύοντος makes the line somewhat suspect.

κατ' αἰθέρα: also *Su.* 990 ff. τί φέγγος, τίν' αἴγλαν / ἐδίφρευε τόθ' ἅλιος / cελάνα τε κατ'αἰθέρα (but cf. Collard ad. loc. on the metrical problem), *HF* 653 f. κατ' αἰθέρ'αἰεὶ πτεροῖcι φορείcθω.

6 ἐc Ἄργος: κατά is only found in later Greek of motion *to* a place (cf. LSJ s.v. B I 2), cf. e.g. Zos. 3, 1 αὐτὸc μὲν κατὰ τὴν 'Ιταλίαν ἐκ Παιονίας διέβη so that ἐc is preferable.

ᾤκιc': cf. Strabo 8, 6, 9 p. 371 C τὴν δὲ ἀκρόπολιν τῶν Ἀργείων οἰκίcαι λέγεται Δαναόc. Itacistic confusion between aor./fut. of οἰκέω and οἰκίζω is quite common; cf. e.g. *IT* 786; IA 662; *Erectheus* fr. 360, 11; perhaps S. *OC* 92 (see Jebb).

'Ινάχου πόλιν: this expression is somewhat ambiguous. Inachos is the most important river of Argos as well as the river-god who was regarded as the first king of Argos. (cf. Kroll in *RE* 9, 1916, 1218 f. s.v. Inachos[1]), and it is hard to see which element is more prominent here. It is very common in

Greek poetry to describe a town or country by a subst. + the name of a legendary king or founder; cf. e.g. Pi. *N.* 7, 30 πρὸϲ Ἴλου πόλιν; 10, 1 Δαναοῦ πόλιν; A. *Th.* 74 Κάδμου πόλιν, 135f.; E. *Hipp.* 26 Πανδίονοϲ γῆν (cf. Barrett ad loc.), *Ba.* 61 Κάδμου πόλιϲ etc. Still, it seems a little awkward to say 'Danaos founded the city of king Inachos', unless indeed this expression had become so common that it did not convey anything more than simply 'Argos'. This awkwardness would not be there if Inachos could be taken to refer to the river. Surely Argos is several times described as 'the streams of the Inachos'; cf. e.g. *Su.* 890f. ἐλθὼν δ' ἐπ' Ἰνάχου ῥοὰϲ / παιδεύεται κατ' Ἄργοϲ, *El.* 1, *Ph.* 574; see comm. on 2 above. But these passages are not exactly parallel, because the subst. indicates the water, not the town or country. I have not, so far, found an unambiguous parallel: *Su.* 1214 Ἰϲμηνοῦ πόλιν is regarded by Collard on 60-62 as town + river, but there is no reason why Ismenos could not be personified here (though he is not so attested elsewhere); in *Su.* 372 γᾶν ... φίλιον Ἰνάχου Collard ad loc. regards Inachos as the "eponymous ancestor" and compares our line and *Or.* 932 ὦ γῆν Ἰνάχου κεκτημένοι, which is also taken as country + king by Σ ad loc., but as country + river by Kannicht on *Hel.* 1-3. Perhaps the idea that Ἰνάχου πόλιν was such a common description of Argos in poetry that nobody bothered about 'king' or 'river' (who, basically, were identical anyway) is the best solution.

7 **Πελαϲγιώταϲ;**: LSJ quote for this word, apart from our passage only Strabo 9, 5, 3 p. 430 C (where it must mean 'inhabitants of Pelasgiotis in Thessaly'). Cf. also Hdt. 2, 171, 3 αἱ Δαναοῦ θυγατέρεϲ ἦϲαν αἱ τὴν τελετὴν ταύτην ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγοῦϲαι καὶ διδάξαϲαι τὰϲ Πελαϲγιώτιδαϲ γυναῖκαϲ. Πελαϲγιώταϲ here obviously are the inhabitants of Argos, which is called Πελαϲγικόν in e.g. *Ph.* 256, *Or.* 1601 (cf. *Heracl.* 316, *Ph.* 107); Πελαϲγόν in e.g. *Or.* 692, 1247, 1296; its inhabitants are called Πελαϲγοί in e.g. *Or.* 857, 933; Πελαϲγία = Argos in *Or.* 960, but may also be used in a wider sense as in *Su.* 367 (where see Collard).

τὸ πρὶν: on τὸ πρίν being often used of "a state of affairs which no longer exists" cf. Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Supp.* 330-2.

7-8 For the change of name cf. *Or.* 933 πάλαι Πελαϲγοί, Δαναΐδαι δεύτερον (del. Musgrave, probably rightly, as Porson's law is violated); Strabo 8, 6, 9 p. 371 C. This account of the change of name is not, I think, to be regarded as superfluous mythological detail, but as it glorifies Danaos it also helps to celebrate his descendant Archelaos. Cf. the way in which other Euripidean characters boast how countries were called after relatives of theirs: *Mel. Sophe* 6 (Page *GLP* 1, 118) (Aiolis called after Melanippe's father Aiolos), *Phrixus II* fr. 819, 7f. (Cilicia called after Cilix, Phoenicia after Phoenix); see J. R. Wilson, AJPh 89, 1968, 68f.; some remarks on peoples called after their kings also in Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Supp.* 252-3.

8 Δαναοὺς: in Hom. Δαναοί always stands for 'Greeks', like Ἀχαιοί and Ἀργεῖοι, e.g. *Il.* 1, 42; *Od.* 11, 559. Cf. P. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, Leipzig 1923[3], 279-284. Also A. and S. use Δαναοί only in this general sense. When speaking about the inhabitants of Argos they call them Πελαςγοί (e.g. A. *Suppl.* 328, 967, S. F 270) or Ἀργεῖοι (e.g. A. *Th.* 59, 120). E. uses Danaoi both of the Greeks in general (usually in contexts which deal with the Greek expedition to Troy, so e.g. *Hec.* 114, 134; *Tr.* 184, 230; *Hel.* 693, 1135; *IA* 135, 324; *Palamedes* fr. 588) and of the inhabitants of Argos, e.g. *Or.* 1621 ὦ γαῖα Δαναῶν ἱππίου τ' Ἄργουc κτίται, *Hyps.* fr. I, III 16 (where see Bond), *Ph.* 430, 1145, 1226, and in our passage. This double use of the term is easily explained, because in the Trojan expedition the leaders were considered to come from the Peloponnesian Argos and because Argos was famous (cf. Strabo 8, 6, 9, 371 C). (R. Drews, *Argos and Argives in the Iliad*, CPh 74, 1979, 111-135 argues that this notion cannot have arisen before VIII B.C., when Argos first became a city of importance, and places the Homeric Argives in Thessaly).

ἔθηκ' ἄν': this must be the right reading, because otherwise there is no way to construct Ἑλλάδα.

νόμον ἔθηκ': for the active ἔθηκ' cf. Jebb on S. *Ant.* 8: "τίθημι νόμον denotes simply the legislative act as such; hence it is fitting when the lawgiver is supreme or absolute". So e.g. S. *Ant.* 7 f. καὶ νῦν τί τοῦτ' αὖ φαcι πανδήμωι πόλει /κήρυγμα θεῖναι τὸν cτρατηγὸν ἀρτίωc; A. *Eu.* 484 (Athena:) θεcμόν, τὸν εἰc ἅπαντ' ἐγὼ θήcω χρόνον. More examples in KG 1, 106 f. Here the fact that he could thus impose himself as a heros eponymos may be meant as an indication of Danaos' power. With this line in general cf. *Ion* 74 f. Ἴωνα δ' αὐτόν ... / ὄνομα κεκλῆcθαι θήcεται καθ' Ἑλλάδα.

PHamb. 118 a col. II = fr. 2 A

As 3-4 deal with the story of Hypermestra and Lynkeus we cannot be very far from fr. 228: 3-4 lines in between would seem sufficient to tell the essentials; whether there were more details given about Danaos or other matters after fr. 228 we cannot tell.

3 .περμ.[.]....: Siegmann ad loc. noticed that some form of Hypermestra is likely, but cannot be verified from the papyrus. I even think the traces after [.]. are rather against this idea, however attractive it may be if one considers the context and the traces up to [.].. If one wants to stick to a form of Hypermestra, this can only be done by regarding the traces after [.]. as misleading, a possibility which, taking into account the bad state of the papyrus, I would not altogether exclude, but still am reluctant to adopt.

The name Hypermestra is not attested in tragedy. A. *Pr.* 865 f. tells the story of Lynkeus and Hypermestra, but without giving their names: μίαν δὲ

παίδων ἵμερος θέλξει, τὸ μὴ / κτεῖναι cύνευνον. Before E. the metrical position of the name could only be ⏑ $\overset{4}{-}$ × $\overset{5}{-}$ in order to avoid *caesura media*. In E. such a caesura is admitted if it is followed by elision, which could here be effected by an elided mono-syllable after a form of Hypermestra (τ', γ', δ'); cf. Siegmann ad loc.

4 οὐκ ἔψαυcε, Λυγκέωc: when the Danaids killed their husbands, the sons of Aigyptos, in their wedding-night, Hypermestra was the only one who let her husband, Lynkeus, live. For this story in literature before E. cf. Pi. *N.* 10, 6f. οὐδ' Ὑπερμήcτρα παρεπλάγχθη, μονό/ψαφον ἐν κολεῷι καταcχοῖcα ξίφοc, A. *Pr.* 865f. (on the question whether or not A. *Danaïdes* dealt with the trial of the dissident Hypermestra cf. e.g. K. von Fritz, *Antike und moderne Tragödie*, Berlin 1962, 171ff.; of course there can be little doubt that Hypermestra was a character in the missing part of the Danaid trilogy) and perhaps Hes. fr. 129, 1ff., 135, 1f. M-W; Archil. fr. 305 West; see further Nonn. *D.* 3, 308ff., Apollod. 2, 1, 5 and perhaps *TrGF* 2, F *730, 5. Cf. Robert[2] 1, 271f.; Bernhard in Roscher 1, 2843f. (s.v. Hypermnestra) and Seeliger in Roscher II 2, 2206f. (s.v. Lynkeus [1]). In E. the murder committed by the Danaids is also alluded to in *Hec.* 886, *HF* 1016ff., but without reference to Lynkeus and Hypermestra.

The interpretation of the line depends on which version of the myth Euripides had in mind here: the reasons given for Hypermestra's conduct vary: (1) she let Lynkeus live because she loved him; cf. A. *Pr.* 865f. (quoted in comm. on 3), where we must not connect παίδων ἵμεροc 'desire for children', but μίαν ... παίδων 'one of the daughters', cf. Groeneboom ad loc. and R. P. Winnington-Ingram, JHS 81, 1961, 147; cf. perhaps also A. *Danaïdes* fr. 44, in which the power of Eros is praised; Σ *Hec.* 886 μία δὲ μόνη τούτων ἡ Ὑπερμνήcτρα ἐφείcατο τοῦ Λυγκέωc, ἀπὸ τῆc μίξεωc διάθεcιν ἐcχηκυῖα πρὸc αὐτόν; Ov. *Her.* 14, 49ff. *timor et pietas* made Hypermestra refrain from killing her husband; in Hor. *Carm.* 3, 11, 25ff. Hypermestra points to her gentle and pitying nature (42f. *ego illis* [sc. my sisters] *mollior*; 46 *quod uiro clemens misero peperci*) and in 49f. says *i .../dum fauet nox et Uenus*, (2) she thus rewarded Lynkeus for respecting her virginity; cf. Apollod. 2, 1, 5 αὕτη γὰρ Λυγκέα διέcωcε παρθένον αὐτὴν φυλάξαντα; Σ Pi. *N.* 10, 10 ἐπεὶ διεφύλαξεν αὐτὴν ἁγνὴν παρθένον ὁ Λυγκεύc.

If E. had this second reason in mind we could put a high point after ἔψαυcε and regard Lynkeus as the subject: '(Lynkeus) did not touch (his bride)'. The use of ψαύω with an erotic connotation could be paralleled by e.g. Pi. *O.* 6, 35 ἔνθα τραφεῖc' ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνι γλυκείαc πρῶτον ἔψαυc' Ἀφροδίταc (and Σ ad loc. δαιμονίωc τὸ ἔψαυcεν ὡc ἐπὶ θείαc ἀφροδιcίων cυνόδου ἔταξε), E. *Hipp.* 14 ἀναίνεται δὲ λέκτρα κοὐ ψαύει γάμων. Drawbacks of this interpretation seem to be (a) that asyndeton after ἔψαυcε would be unavoidable, as supplements like δ'ἄπο or δὲ παῖc (cf. *IT* 3f.) are not favoured by the traces

in the papyrus, (b) that immediately after οὐκ ἔψαυςε it is told how Abas was born as a son of Lynkeus, implying the sequence 'Lynkeus did not touch his wife and begot a son Abas': this strikes me as rather odd.

If E. regarded love for Lynkeus as Hypermestra's motive for not killing him, we have to take ἔψαυςε in the sense 'lay hands upon, touch as an enemy' (LSJ s.v. 3), cf. e.g. *Andr.* 758 f. κλαίων ἄρα / ψαύςει, *El.* 223 ἄπελθε, μὴ ψαῦ' ὧν cε μὴ ψαύειν χρεών, *IA* 1559 πρὸc ταῦτα μὴ ψαύcῃ τιc Ἀργείων ἐμοῦ. In that case I can think of three possibilities as to the interpretation of the line: (a) ἔψαυςε Λυγκέωc must go together ('... Hypermestra did not touch Lynkeus'); this possibility is discussed by Siegmann ad loc., who remarks that then either the line had to end with an adj. going with Lynkeus or Hypermestra (e.g. μόνου or μόνῃ), with the drawback that 5 has to follow asyndetically, or that the sentence must end with Λυγκέωc (which is trisyllabic because of Porson's Law), which is not attractive because Euripides usually avoids a strong stop after the fifth longum; cf. Maas 68; Wilamowitz and Bond on *HF* 280 (exceptions are very rare, but cf. e.g. *Heracl.* 567, *HF* 975; J. D. Denniston, CQ 30, 1936, 73 ff.). One may add that with this punctuation it seems very hard to think of a suitable supplement for the rest of the line: I can only think of ἀφ'οὗ, which, however, seems oddly placed then (cf. for contrast *IT* 3) and does not suit the traces in the papyrus. Siegmann therefore rejected as less likely the possibility that ψαύω = 'to kill' here. Yet, these objections really only seem to rule out punctuation after Λυγκέωc, but not necessarily the possibility that ψαύω = 'to kill', because (b) ἔψαυςε may govern a gen. preceding it (e.g.—forgetting the traces in the papyrus—Λυγκέωc or αὐτοῦ); in that case there may have been a stop after ἔψαυςε, but a drawback again seems to be that asyndeton is unavoidable (see above); or (c) οὐκ ἔψαυςε could be part of a subordinate clause or parenthesis (cf. e.g. *Or.* 16 f.) and Λυγκέωc π̣α̣τ̣ρ̣ὸ̣c̣ / Ἄ[β]αc ἐγένετο could be (part of) the main clause, a solution which has the advantages of being compatible with the traces in the papyrus and avoiding an awkward asyndeton and, therefore, of all the possibilities mentioned, seems to be the most attractive.

An extra argument in favour of (c) is the fact that the traces in the papyrus before ο̣ὐκ̣ are strongly in favour of γα̣ρ̣. I have not been able to read the first word(s) of the line, but as the third letter looks very much like μ and the trace before γα̣ρ̣ is vertical, one could think of e.g. νύμφῃ, γάμων / -ου (but see above for objections) (δάμαρ seems a little too wide and perhaps less suitable). But none of them can be really verified from the papyrus.

4 f. Cf. *TrGF* 2, F 454 cφαγὰc δὲ Δαναοῦ παρθένων Λυγκεὺc φυγὼν / Ἄβαντα φύει διάδοχον τυραννίδοc. Wagner 672 and Van Herwerden² 326 suggested that this fragment was from the *Archelaos*. It is clear now, that this guess, though plausible in itself, was wrong (cf. app. 2 B 11).

5 τοῦ: with demonstrative force; cf. e.g. *Ph.* 8 f. τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακον / φῦναι

λέγουσιν, *Or.* 11 τοῦ δ' Ἀτρεὺς ἔφυ, fr. 14, 2 τοῦ δ' Αἴολος παῖς; KG 1, 581 ff.

δίπτυχον: compound adjectives of this type are very common in E.; often the second part has wholly lost its original force, as it has here. Cf. e.g. *Med.* 1136 δίπτυχος γονή, *Andr.* 471, *Ph.* 1354, and line 12 of our fragment; Breitenbach 190; Page on *Med.* 1136.

6 Proitos' daughters went mad because they had insulted a god: in some versions it was Dionysos (e.g. Hes. fr. 131), in others Hera (e.g. B. 11, 40 ff.); cf. Apollod. 2, 2, 2 (and Frazer ad loc.); Robert[2] 1, 246 ff.; Rapp in Roscher III 2, 3001 ff. (s.v. Proitides). In structure the line is very similar to fr. 228, 1.

In **6-8** it is explained, in the form of an apposition, what the δίπτυχον γένος consists of. For similar constructions in Euripidean prologues cf. e.g. *Hel.* 8 ff. τίκτει δὲ τέκνα δισσὰ τοῖσδε δώμασι, / Θεοκλύμενον ἄρσεν' [ὅτι δὴ θεοὺς σέβων / βίον διήνεγκ'] εὐγενῆ τε παρθένον / Εἰδώ, *Ph.* 55 f., *Or.* 22 f., *IA* 49 ff. and 12 ff. of our fragment.

7 ff. For the story of Danae cf. Pherecyd. *FGrH* 3 F 10; Apollod. 2, 4, 1; Robert[2] 1, 229 ff., Stoll in Roscher 1, 946 ff. (s.v. Danae [1]) and Kuhnert in Roscher III 2, 1986 ff. (s.v. Perseus). In literature before the *Archelaos* we find the most elaborate treatment of the story in S. *Ant.* 944-50 ἔτλα καὶ Δανάας οὐράνιον φῶς / ἀλλάξαι δέμας ἐν χαλκοδέτοις / αὐλαῖς· κρυπτομένα δ'ἐν / τυμβήρει θαλάμωι κατεζεύχθη· / καίτοι ⟨καὶ⟩ γενεᾶι τί/μιος, ὦ παῖ παῖ, / καὶ Ζηνὸς ταμιεύε/σκε γονὰς χρυσορύτους, of which our passage perhaps contains some reminiscences, cf. (1) χαλκέωι νυμφεύματ[ι with ἐν χαλκοδέτοις αὐλαῖς, (2) νυμφεύματ[ι with θαλάμωι: in both passages the prison seems to be referred to as a bridal chamber, (3) ἐκ χρυσορρύτων / σταγόνων with γονὰς χρυσορύτους. But esp. (1) and (3) may well have been conventional in this story, in which case, of course, one cannot really speak about reminiscences (for details see comm.). Further allusions are *Il.* 14, 319 f. (Zeus and Danae as parents of Perseus), Pi. *P.* 12, 17 f.; the theme must also have been dealt with in Sophocles' and Euripides' *Danae*, and may well have been alluded to in A. *Diktyoulkoi*, S. *Akrisios* and *Larisaioi* and E. *Diktys*.

7 ὅς τ': 'and he who ..., Akrisios', for this structure cf. KG 2, 419, 4: "Die Apposition zu dem Substantive, auf welches sich der Adjektivsatz bezieht, wird bisweilen in diesen gezogen, wenn sie hier eine geeignetere oder nachdrücklichere Stellung einnimmt". So e.g. *Il.* 7, 186 f. τὸν ἵκανε ..., / ὅς μιν ἐπιγράψας κυνέηι βάλε, φαίδιμος Αἴας, E. *Hec.* 771 πρὸς ἄνδρ' ὃς ἄρχει τῆσδε Πολυμήστωρ χθονός. In an autonomous relative clause (without antecedent) we find this construction in e.g. fr. 14, 2 ff. Αἰόλου δὲ Σίσυφος / Ἀθάμας τε Κρηθεύς θ'ὅς τ'ἐπ' Ἀλφειοῦ ῥοαῖς / θεοῦ μανεὶς ἔρριψε Σαλμονεὺς φλόγα (very similar to our passage). Cf. Call. *h.* 4, 20 f. Μάκρις ... / Σαρδὼ θ' ἱμερόεσσα καὶ ἣν ἐπενήξατο Κύπρις (νῆσος understood from 18); S. *Tr.* 94 ff.

ἐγκατῆγεν: this seems to be the only reading that accounts for the space and the traces in the papyrus. Forms of ἐγκλείω, ἐγκατακλείω, ἐγκαθείργω, ἐγκατορύσσω, and ἐγκατέχω were rejected by Siegmann and, indeed, none of them fits the space or traces. ἐγκαλύπτει must, I think, be rejected for similar reasons; it may be worth adding that ἐγκαλύπτω, which is not attested in tragedy, is used of 'veiling' and 'wrapping up' rather than of 'locking in' (cf. e.g. Ar. *Ra.* 911, *Pl.* 707, 714; Pl. *Phd.* 118 a and LSJ s.v.), so that also for semantic reasons it is not very attractive to restore it here.

Of ἐγκατάγω LSJ mention only the med. ἐγκατάγομαι 'put up at a place' and quote Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 132 (3) προσσυμβαίνει τοῖς ἀποδημοῦσι καὶ μακρὰν ὁδὸν διεξιοῦσιν ὅπου μὲν ἐγκατάγεσθαί τε καὶ ἐναυλίζεσθαι μόνον, ὅπου δὲ ἐναριστᾶν, ὅπου δὲ πλείους ἐνδημεῖν ἡμέρας and Poll. 1, 73 (Bethe) οἰκῆσαι, ἐνοικῆσαι, κατάγεσθαι, ἐγκατάγεσθαι, ἐνδιαιτηθῆναι etc. This offers some support for ἐγκατῆγεν in the required sense, and I think that if we compare Pherecyd. *FGrH* 3 F 10 (61, 12) ἔνθα τὴν Δανάην εἰσάγει and take into consideration that Danae's prison was generally regarded as being below the earth (see comm. below), ἐγκατῆγεν is quite acceptable.

χαλκέωι νυμφεύματ[ι: the prison of Danae, which tradition located below the earth; cf. S. *Ant.* 944 ff. (which does not mention the location explicitly, but strongly suggests that it was considered as a subterranean prison), Pherecyd. *FGrH* 3 F 10 (61, 11 f.) θάλαμον ... χαλκοῦν ... κατὰ γῆς, Apollod. 2, 4, 1 ὑπὸ γῆν θάλαμον ... χάλκεον; differently Paus. 2, 23, 7; Hor. *Carm.* 3, 16, 1 f.

χαλκέωι: the adj. χαλκέωι should not, I think, be interpreted primarily as a reflection of building-conventions which had once been in existence (so e.g. Jebb on S. *Ant.* 944 f. pointing to the 'Treasury of Atreus' at Mycenae, which had bronze plates nailed to its walls [cf. G. E. Mylonas, *Ancient Mycenae*, Princeton 1957, 86] and Ameis-Hentze on *Od.* 7, 86), but rather as chosen to denote the strength of the prison, which left no possibilities for escape. The bronze walls may even have denoted a magical power, as is suggested by D. E. W. Wormell, *Walls of brass in literature*, Hermathena 58, 1941, 116-20, who remarks about Danae that she "is imprisoned in the tower of bronze to protect her against the approaches of a supernatural power: but in her case the magic of bronze is overcome by the still more potent magic of gold" (p. 118). So also in many of the other instances in which bronze is mentioned as 'building-material' there is primarily a connotation of magical strength and splendour; cf. e.g. *Il.* 8, 15 σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδός (sc. of Hades), 18, 371 (house of Hephaistos); *Od.* 7, 86 (the palace of Alkinoos), 10, 4 (the island of Aiolos); Hes. *Th.* 726 (the walls of Tartaros; cf. West ad loc.), *Op.* 150 (cf. West); Pi. *Pae.* 8, 68 f. χάλκεοι μὲν τοῖχοι χάλκ[εαί / θ'ὑπὸ κίονες ἕστασαν; B. 3, 32 χαλκ[ο]τειχέος π[ροπάροι]θεν αὐ[λᾶς (cf. Maehler ad loc.; Pl. *Criti.* 116 b (walls of Atlantis); Aeschin. 3, 84 χαλκοῖς καὶ

ἀδαμαντίνοις τείχεσιν ... τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν ἐτείχισε, τῆι τῶν Εὐβοέων καὶ Θηβαίων συμμαχίαι ('bronze walls' metaphorically for strong allies); Antim. fr. 187, 3 Wyss χάλκεοι Ἀράων θάλαμοι (sc. of Hades).

Because in S. *Ant.* 944ff. Danae's prison is compared to a tomb some scholars were led to the belief that the prison was represented in myth as a Mycenaean tomb (so Jebb on S. *Ant.* 944f. Robert[2] 1, 230; Stoll in Roscher 1, 947 (s.v. Danae [1]). But as these lines in the *Antigone* are very probably inspired by the fate of Antigone, who was indeed to be burried alive in a tomb, it seems dangerous to draw conclusions from them as to the nature of Danae's prison in general.

νυμφεύματ[ι: the usual meaning of the word is either 'marriage' (plural) or 'the person married' (singular), cf. LSJ s.v. Here, however, neither of these fits and we must look for another meaning. The context seems to demand 'bridal chamber'; for comparable words in -μα cf. S. *Ant.* 1220f. ἐν δὲ λοισθίωι τυμβεύματι / τὴν ... κατείδομεν, E. *El.* 1274 Λυκαίου πλησίον σηκώματος, *Ba.* 120f. ὦ θαλάμευμα Κουρή/των. On words in -μα in general (which were very popular in tragedy and especially in Euripides) cf. Chantraine 183ff.; A. A. Long, *Language and thought in Sophocles*, London 1968, 35f.; 90 ff. In S. *Ant.* 891f. Antigone addresses her tomb as ὦ τύμβος, ὦ νυμφεῖον, ὦ κατασκαφὴς / οἴκησις ἀείφρουρος and in 1205 the messenger calls it a νυμφεῖον; in 804 (where see Jebb) θάλαμον seems to be used in the same sense, and perhaps in 946 too. It seems possible therefore that the paradox prison/bridal chamber contains a reminiscence of these passages in Sophocles.

8 In the gap we expect something which tells us the relation between Akrisios and Danae (hence, apparently, Siegmann's consideration of θύγατρα [sic] and πατὴ[ρ), as elsewhere in this genealogy (and in others) Euripides is very careful to express these things. Another, less attractive, possibility would be that the reason for the imprisonment is given (cf. the supplements of Austin and Snell, which however, cannot be verified from the papyrus).

9f. On Perseus cf. Apollod. 2, 4, 1ff.; Robert[2] 1, 222ff.; Kuhnert in Roscher III 2, 1986ff. (s.v. Perseus).

ἐγένετ': Siegmann ad loc. remarks that γίγνομαί τινος ἔκ τινος does not seem to be attested. Still, the construction can easily be explained: Δανάης is the gen. of the parent which is normal with γίγνομαι (cf. KG 1, 373f.), whereas ἐκ χρυσορρύτων / σταγόνων indicates the other parent (here only represented by the seed) as in e.g. 12 ἣ τριπτύχους ἐγείνατ' ἐκ Περσέως κόρους, *Andr.* 1236f. ἐκ σοῦ παῖδα τὸν ταχὺν πόδας / Ἀχιλλέα τεκοῦσα, fr. 215, 2 ἐσθλῶν ἀπ'ἀλόχων εὐγενῆ σπείρειν τέκνα.

ἐκ χρυσορρύτων / σταγόνων: this is obviously a reference to the familiar legend of the conception of Perseus in which Zeus approached Danae in the shape of golden rain; the story is often alluded to in Greek literature and the

expressions used are all reminiscent of each other: Pi. *P.* 12, 17f. υἱὸc Δανάαc, τὸν ἀπὸ χρυcοῦ φαμὲν αὐτορύτου / ἔμμεναι, S. *Ant.* 950 (quoted above), Isoc. 10, 59 χρυcὸc δὲ ῥυεὶc Δανάηι cυνεγένετο, Men. *Sam.* 589ff. οὐκ ἀκήκοαc λεγόντων ... / τῶν τραγωιδῶν ὡc γενόμενοc χρυcὸc ὁ Ζεὺc ἐρρύη / διὰ τέγουc κατειργμένην τε παῖδ' ἐμοίχευcέν ποτε; cf. also A. *Pers.* 80.

χρυcορρύτων: the adj. is first attested in A. *Pr.* 805f. οἳ χρυcόρρυτον / οἰκοῦcιν ἀμφὶ νᾶμα Πλούτωνοc πόρου and subsequently in S. *Ant.* 950. For later occurrences cf. I. Kazik-Zawadzka, *Les hapax eiremena et les mots rares dans les fragments papyrologiques des trois grands tragiques Grecs*, Varsovie 1962, 111.

For the spelling cf. Jebb on S. *OC* 469: "The rule is that ρ is doubled when, by inflection or composition a *simple vowel* precedes it, but remains single when a *diphthong* precedes it: hence νεόρρυτοc, but ἀείρυτοc ... Metre often led the poets to use ρ instead of ρρ as ἀμφῐρύτου (*Aj.* 134), χρυcορύτουc (*Ant.* 950) ... But there is no classical instance of the opposite anomaly."

cταγόνων: this word denotes at the same time the idea of 'a stream of golden drops' and 'seed'. With similar ambiguity we find it used in fr. 839, 3ff. ἣ (sc. Gaia) δ' ὑγροβόλουc cταγόναc νοτίαc / παραδεξαμένη τίκτει θνητούc, / τίκτει βοτάνην φῦλά τε θηρῶν· / ὅθεν οὐκ ἀδίκωc / μήτηρ πάντων νενόμιcται ('rain' and 'seed'; for the idea cf. *Su.* 205f., fr. inc. 898, 7-13; A. fr. 44), Lucr. 2, 991ff. *denique caelesti sumus omnes semine oriundi / omnibus ille idem pater est, unde alma liquentis / umoris guttas mater cum terra recepit*; Hes. *Th.* 183f. ὅccαι γὰρ ῥαθάμιγγεc ἀπέccυθεν αἱματόεccαι, / πάcαc δέξατο Γαῖα (and became pregnant). Cf. also the use of cτάζω in Pi. *N.* 10, 80ff. τόνδε δ' ἔπειτα πόcιc / cπέρμα θνατὸν ματρὶ τεᾶι πελάcαιc / cτάξεν ἥρωc; and for a similar use of dew Call. fr. 260, 19 δρ[ό]cον Ἡφαίcτοιο, Nonn. *D.* 41, 63f. ὃν τέκε Γαίηc / αὔλακι νυμφεύcαc γαμίην Ἥφαιcτοc ἐέρcην. On the connection of water(drops) and seed in general cf. W. M. Clarke, AC 43, 1974, 69ff.

ἐλθὼν: sc. to Aithiopia, which can be inferred from the next line. Cf. Apollod. 2, 4, 3 παραγενόμενοc δὲ εἰc Αἰθιοπίαν (sc. on his flight from the other Gorgons).

Γοργόνοc καρατόμοc: cf. *Alc.* 1118 Γοργόν' ὡc καρατομῶν, fr. 123 Περcεὺc πρὸc Ἄργοc ναυcτολῶν τὸ Γοργόνοc / κάρα κομίζων, Apollod. 2, 4, 2 ἐκαρατόμηcεν αὐτήν; Hes. *Th.* 280 τῆc (sc. Gorgo) ... Περcεὺc κεφαλὴν ἀποδειροτόμηcεν. Καρατόμοc + gen. occurs again in Lyc. 187 Ἑλλάδοc καρατόμον, which may well be a reminiscence of our passage.

11 Αἰθίοπ': the masc. form of the adjective is here used instead of the fem. Αἰθιοπίc (which is used in e.g. fr. 228, 4). Cf. also Eusth. *Od.* 1484, 47ff., quoting A. fr. 328 Αἰθίοπα φωνὴν and 329 γυνὴ τιc Αἰθίοψ.

Ἀνδρομέδαν: on the resolution of the second breve see Maas 67.

Κηφέως: according to Apollod. 2, 1, 4 (= E. fr. inc. 881) Euripides said that Kepheus and Phineus were brothers of Aigyptos and Danaos. This must be based on another play, as here Kepheus belongs to the generation of Danae. Cf. also Σ A. *Suppl.* 318. Siegmann ad loc. suggested: "Vielleicht hat Euripides die Genealogie in der "Andromeda" etwas anders dargestellt" (if so, fr. 881 would refer to *Andromeda*).

12 τριπτύχους: cf. *HF* 474, *Ph.* 1635 and comm. on 5 δίπτυχον.

ἐγείνατ': γείνασθαι is mostly used of the mother; here the other parent is brought in by ἐκ Περσέως. Siegmann ad loc. notices that "γείνασθαι (von der Mutter) ἐκ scheint unbelegt". But see comm. on 9 for similar expressions. We may also compare the use of γείνασθαι with the dat. or ὑπό + dat. of the father; cf. *Alc.* 838 f. οἷον παῖδά ... γείνατ' Ἀλκμήνη Διί, *Ion* 3 f. ἥ 'μ' ἐγείνατο / Ἑρμῆν μεγίστωι Ζηνί; *Od.* 11, 299.

In other sources Perseus has more children than the three sons recorded here; cf. Apollod. 2, 4, 5: six sons and a daughter; Σ *Il.* 19, 116: five sons; Σ A.R. 1, 747: four sons—among them are Alkaios, Sthenelos and Elektryon; cf. Kuhnert in Roscher III 2, 2023 f. (s.v. Perseus). Siegmann ad loc. remarks: "Der Grund für die Beschränkung auf 3 Söhne an dieser Stelle ist nicht zu erkennen; es fehlen Heleios, Mestor und die Tochter Gorgophone". However, these three are not attested in sources that are earlier than the mythographers mentioned above, so it may well be that Euripides here represents an older version, in which case we cannot speak about 'Beschränkung'. There is a similar case in fr. 819, 6 ff., where Euripides says that Agenor had three sons, whereas in Σ *Ph.* 217 six sons and a daughter are mentioned; according to Van Looy 136 n. 6 our sources show that in the course of time the genealogy centred more and more around Agenor, i.e. that he got more and more children attributed to him. Something similar may have happened in the case of Perseus. It may be relevant also to notice that three sons is a 'typical' number in folk-tale; cf. J. W. S. Blom, *De typische getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos* 1, Nijmegen 1936, 70 ff..

13 For the construction see comm. on 6.

ἠδὲ: this epic word occurs also in *Hec.* 323, *HF* 30, *IA* 812 (all in dialogue); in S. it is found two times (F 386, 1; 549, 1; perhaps also in *Ant.* 673 [but cf. Jebb ad loc.], *Ph.* 491 [ci. Jebb], F 314, 17 [ci. Snell], and 583, 10 [ci. Schneidewin]). In A. it is found more often, especially in the *Persae* (e.g. 21 f., 26, 289 etc.; cf. also *Th.* 862, *Ag.* 42, fr. 191), but rarely in ia. trim. Only in the *Oresteia* we sometimes find it in dialogue (*Ch.* 232 [Turnebus], 1025, *Eu.* 188, 414 [doubtful]). Cf. Denniston 287 f.; on ἠδέ in tragedy also KG 2, 299 Anm. 2. Very often it is used, like here, in lists of names.

13-14 ὅς τ': at first sight it seems likely that ὅς τ' here too means 'et qui', as it undoubtedly does in 7 (see comm.); it would certainly be very unusual if it did not, because the so-called epic τε is not elsewhere attested in ia. trim. in

Euripides, but appears only in lyrics. The same is true of Sophocles; only in Aeschylus we sometimes find epic τε in dialogue; cf. Ruijgh 999ff.; KG 2, 236f.

Siegmann ad loc. argues that the sense also requires 'et qui', comparing Apollod. 2, 4, 6: after the death of Perseus Elektryon became king of Mycenae; only after he had died Sthenelos drove Alkmene and Amphitryon away from Argos and made himself king of Mycenae and Tiryns. This argument, however, does not seem decisive: in itself the relative clause suits Sthenelos just as well as Elektryon, and even if he got Mycenae only after the death of Elektryon, this does not necessarily imply that his coming to power cannot be referred to before Elektryon is mentioned. Also, there seems to be more point in saying that Sthenelos acquired Mycenae than in telling that Elektryon acquired it: Elektryon was the legitimate successor and one of the kings of Argos who were the ancestors of Archelaos, so that it seems hardly necessary to stress the point that he was 'king of Argos'. On the other hand, Sthenelos' coming to power in Argos broke the chain and may therefore be worth mentioning. Besides, if his usurpation of the throne is mentioned here, the contents of 17f. also become clearer: the vagueness of these lines rightly stroke Siegmann ad loc.: "Der ingressive Aorist ὤικηcε zeigt, dass die (Wieder)inbesitznahme gemeint ist... Das ist auffällig, da von einer Vertreibung der Herakliden nichts erzählt war". If ὅc τ' — Μυκήναc could be taken to refer to Sthenelos, the exile of the family would at least be hinted at.

Taking ὅc τ' as 'qui' instead of 'et qui' would also free us from an otherwise rather awkward construction: if we take ὅc τ' as 'et qui' we find that we are told two things about Elektryon: he was king of Mycenae and father of Alkmene, these two facts being connected by δέ. Siegmann ad loc. explains: "δὲ führt die zweite Prädikation zu Elektryon ein; damit steht die Apposition πατέρα δὲ in einem explizierenden Verhältnis zum vorhergehenden Relativsatz: 'nämlich' den Vater der Alkmene". But I cannot see what he means by "explizierend" here, nor is there any such relation between the elements connected by δέ in the parallels which Siegmann gives, i.e. *Hec.* 534 ὦ παῖ Πηλέωc, πατὴρ δ' ἐμόc, S. *OC* 322f. παῖδα cήν, ἐμὴν δ' ... / ὅμαιμον, 1275 ὦ cπέρματ' ἀνδρὸc τοῦδ', ἐμαὶ δ' ὁμαίμονεc. The δέ in these examples clearly connects two aspects of a person which consist in two different relations this person has to two different persons; cf. also A. *Pers.* 151f., E. *Med.* 970, *HF* 97, *El.* 1243; and in prose Hdt. 1, 114, 5 (more examples in Stein ad loc.), Pl. *Prt.* 310 a, X. *An.* 1, 7, 9; cf. KG 2, 243 Anm. 1, Denniston 163 and for more examples Elmsley on *Med.* 940.

Denniston 163 remarks that this δέ can also be used if the two qualifications which it connects are not *eiusdem generis*, i.e. not only "his brother and my cousin", but also "his brother, and the governor of Malta", which is what we would have here. However, if one examines his examples more closely they

turn out to be not very convincing: (1) A. *Ag.* 1404f. ἐμὸϲ / πόϲιϲ, νεκρὸϲ δὲ τῆϲδε δεξιᾶϲ χερόϲ: punctuation after χερόϲ makes this *eiusdem generis*; cf. Groeneboom and Fraenkel ad loc., (2) A. *Th.* 277: a *locus graviter corruptus*, (3) A. *Ch.* 189f. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν νιν ἡ κτανοῦϲ' ἐκείρατο, / ἐμή γε μήτηρ (γε Porson: δέ *M*): could be regarded as, in a way, *eiusdem generis* (cf. Groeneboom), (4) A. *Ch.* 839ff. νέαν φάτιν ... οὐδαμῶϲ ἐφίμερον, / μόρον γ' Ὀρέϲτου (γ' Portus: δ' *M*): different sort of δέ, cf. Groeneboom ad loc.: "δέ contrasteert de positieve aanduiding μόρον Ὀρέϲτου met de negatieve οὐδαμῶϲ ἐφίμερον", (5) E. *Andr.* 248 Ἑλένη νιν ὤλεϲ', οὐκ ἐγώ, μήτηρ δὲ ϲή: here it is much better to follow Stevens' interpretation. This would, as far as I can see, leave our passage as the only real example of "his brother and the governor of Malta". One could, perhaps, accept this if it were not that the two aspects are not only different as to their contents, but also differently constructed: an acc. combined with a relative clause in this way strikes me as very odd, even though the relative clause is virtually equivalent to 'the king of Mycenae' (in all the examples there are two substantives in the same case).

If we could take ὅϲ τ' to mean 'qui' this awkwardness would disappear and epic τε could, perhaps, be defended as an archaism (we would then have epic τε of a so-called *fait temporaire*, which is not among the other certain instances of epic τε in E., which are all of a *fait permanent* (*Hec.* 445, *Ion* 882, *Or.* 321). Even so, this may be due to accident, as (1) epic τε of *faits temporaires* is well attested in A. and S. (cf. Ruijgh 999ff.), (2) it seems unavoidable with the adv. rel. ἦτε in *IA* 573ff. ἔμολεϲ, ὦ Πάριϲ, ἦτε ϲύ γε / βουκόλοϲ ἀργενναῖϲ ἐτράφηϲ / Ἰδαίαιϲ παρὰ μόϲχοιϲ, on which Ruijgh 1003 remarks: "L'emploi de τε est tout à fait irrégulier: la relative est autonome et exprime un fait temporaire", and cannot be excluded in *IA* 1495 (though Ruijgh 1003 prefers to take this τε as connective).

The structure of 13f. would then resemble such lines as *Il.* 15, 188 (three sons of Kronos:) Ζεὺϲ καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατοϲ δ' Ἀΐδηϲ, ἐνέροιϲιν ἀνάϲϲων, *Il.* 14, 117f. (three sons of Portheus:) Ἄγριοϲ ἠδὲ Μέλαϲ, τρίτατοϲ δ' ἦν ἱππότα Οἰνεύϲ, / πατρὸϲ ἐμοῖο πατήρ. Still, one could object that my solution means merely exchanging one anomaly for another. Neither solution is entirely satisfactory. One might think of changing the text and read ὅϲ γ' (Prof. Lloyd-Jones suggests this to me), but a difficulty would be that γε with the relative pronoun would have to mean 'ut qui', 'quippe qui' (cf. Denniston 141 f. and the examples quoted there), and we do not want this meaning here.

Ἄργουϲ πόλιν / Μυκήναϲ: Argos is used here, as probably in fr. 228, 6, not of the town, but in the sense of 'Argolis, the plain of Argos'. Ἄργοϲ used in this wider sense we find often in poetry (according to *LFrGrE* s.v. Ἄργοϲ [esp. II] we find Ἄργοϲ in this wider sense as early as Homer; but cf. for a different opinion R. Drews, CPh 74, 1979, 120ff.); and sometimes in prose, cf. e.g. Th. 6, 105 (more examples in Classen-Steup ad loc.). A similar distinction between

Argos = Argolis and Mycenae = the town is also apparent in *IT* 508 ff., where Orestes says τὸ κλεινὸν Ἄργος πατρίδ' ἐμὴν ἐπεύχομαι and then adds that he comes ἐκ τῶν Μυκηνῶν; *Hyps.* I, IV, 34 ἐκ τῶν Μυκηνῶν [ἐς]μὲν Ἀργεῖοι γέν[ος; cf. Denniston on *El.* 1, Jebb on S. *El.* 4.

ἔ[c]χεν: the papyrus offers no help as to the question whether ἔcχεν or εἶχεν was written, but the context rather favours the aor. (the whole genealogy is in aor. or pres. *annalisticum*).

15-16 ἐc ... λέχοc / πε̣[c]ω̣ν: Siegmann prefers πα̣[ρ]ω̣ν and compares *Or.* 1313 f. ἐc μέcον φόνον / ... πάρεcτι, Hdt. 1, 9, 2 παρέcται ... ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐc κοῖτον (cf. also *Ba.* 454 ἐc Θήβαc πάρει). But πε̣[c]ω̣ν is palaeographically pretty certain (vertical trace after π excludes α̣) and is also more easily supplied with parallels from similar contexts: *Hec.* 927 ὡc πέcοιμ' ἐc εὐνάν, *Stheneboia* 9 (Page *GLP* 1, 128) κρυφαῖον εὐνῆc εἰc ὁμιλίαν πεcεῖν, fr. inc. 889 πεcεῖν ἐc εὐνὴν καὶ γαμήλιον λέχοc; with ἐν + dat. cf. e.g. *Alc.* 1059, *Hel.* 1093 (where see Kannicht), *Or.* 35 and 88. Other possibilities mentioned by Siegmann, but which I find to be palaeographically impossible, are μο[λ]ὼν and ἐλ[θ]ὼν.

16 κλεινόν: cf. *HF* 12 and 1414 ὁ κλεινὸc Ἡρακλῆc, S. *Tr.* 19 ὁ κλεινὸc ἦλθε Ζηνὸc Ἀλκμήνηc τε παῖc; and — somewhat different because of the dat. — A. *Pr.* 872 τόξοιcι κλεινόc (Herakles). On κλεινόc as "a regular title of royalty" see Denniston on *El.* 327.

cπείρει: cπείρω in the sense 'engender, beget' (LSJ s.v. I 2) is found mainly in Sophocles and Euripides; cf. e.g. S. *Aj.* 1293, E. *Ba.* 1234 (see further Allen-Italie s.v.). In earlier literature I have not found cπείρω used in this sense; but one may compare A. *Th.* 754 ματρὸc ἁγνὰν / cπείραc ἄρουραν (of Oidipus), and the use of cπέρμα (cf. LSJ s.v. II 3). The pres. obviously is the so-called 'genealogical present' or *praesens annalisticum* which is very common if one is recording important happenings as birth, death, marriage etc. Cf. e.g. *IT* 2, *Hel.* 6, 8, *Ph.* 13, *Or.* 11, 19, *Ba.* 2, *Telephos* fr. 102, 5 A and KG 1, 137; Schwyzer 2, 272.

Ἡρακλέουc ... δέμαc: = Herakles, with the connotation of 'powerful Herakles'; cf. KG 1, 280 d: "In der Sprache der Tragiker und Lyriker vorzüglich δέμαc zur Bezeichnung erhabener und majestätischer Persönlichkeit". This way of describing a person by δέμαc + gen. or adj. is attested only once in A. (*Eu.* 84 μητρῷον δέμαc) and rarely in S. (e.g. *Tr.* 908 οἰκετῶν δέμαc, *Ant.* 944 f. Δανάαc δέμαc). Euripides uses it very frequently, e.g. *HF* 1036 f. Ἡράκλειον δέμαc, *Or.* 107 θυγατρὸc Ἑρμιόνηc δέμαc, *Hec.* 724, *El.* 968, 1341 etc. (cf. Allen-Italie s.v. δέμαc). It is clear even from these few examples that the device is not restricted to the description of an "erhabene und majestätische Persönlichkeit"; often it is nothing more than a poetic equivalent of a person's name or a simple subst. See further Breitenbach 198 f.; Bond on *HF* 1036 (with further references).

17 On Hyllos cf. Apollod. 2, 8, 1 f.; Robert[2] 2, 651 ff.

τοῦδ̣[ε]: although the room for ε is a little wide, it is hard to see what else could have stood here.

Τήμενος δ' Ὕλλου πατρός: the usual genealogy is Hyllos–Kleodaios–Aristomachos–Temenos (cf. e.g. Hdt. 6, 52, 1, Hyg. *fab.* 124 and the variants of the pedigree in *FGrH* II B 401 f.). Occasionally we find Kleodaios as the father of Temenos; cf. Apollod. 2, 8, 2 (but see Frazer's notes), Σ Lyc. 804 (Kleodotos). But I could find no other instance of Temenos being called a son of Hyllos. Cf. Waser in Roscher 5, 356 (s.v. Temenos [3]), Robert[2] 2, 656 f.

It looks as if Euripides has deliberately shortened the genealogy here, by leaving out one or two generations which were perhaps considered to be of less interest. A similar proceeding can be observed if one compares *Ion* 63 'Zeus–Aiolos' with *Mel. Sophe* 1 f. (Page *GLP* 1, 118) and *Aiolos* fr. 14 'Zeus–Hellen–Aiolos' (cf. Van Looy 202) and perhaps *Hyps.* fr. I, III 7 f. 'Aigina–Peleus' (cf. Bond ad loc.) with *IA* 697 ff. 'Aigina–Aiakos–Peleus'; cf. also Σ *Hec.* 3 about E.'s free treatment of genealogical matters.

18 ὃς Ἄργος ᾤικης': Siegmann thought that it might be palaeographically better to read ἐς instead of ὅς, but refrains from this reading because (1) οἰκεῖν ἐς does not seem to be attested, (2) "auch hätte Ὕλλου πατρός in dem Satz Τήμενος δ' Ὕλλου πατρὸς ἐς Ἄργος ᾤικησε eine syntaktisch nicht ganz deutliche Funktion neben Ἡρακλέους γεγὼς ἄπο; sachlich wäre es natürlich = Ὕλλου υἱός". What is really fatal to the idea is, I think, that with both Ὕλλος δὲ τοῦδ̣[ε] and Τήμενος δ' Ὕλλου πατρός, one must mentally supply some verb like ἐγένετο, ἦν, ἔφυ, so that syntactically it is not possible to continue with ἐς Ἄργος ᾤικης'.

There can be no doubt that ὅς refers to Temenos, because (1) the ingressive aor. ᾤικης' (cf. e.g. fr. 558, 2 ff.; 819, 4) indicates that a coming (back) to Argos must be meant, and that of course only fits Temenos (on Temenos bringing about the return of the Heraclids to Argos cf. Apollod. 2, 8, 2 ff., Robert[2] 2, 658 ff.; that the story was known to and exploited by Euripides is certain now that we have fragments of the hypotheses of his *Temenos* and *Temenidai* in *POxy.* 27, 2455 frs. 8, 9, 10, 11 and prob. 107 = *PMich.* inv. 1319 [cf. app. 2 C 1 and 2]; cf. Siegmann ad loc.), (2) it would be very unusual in the straightforward structure of the genealogy to return to Hyllos here, because he has had his turn already, (3) if ὅς referred to Hyllos, Ἡρακλέους γεγὼς ἄπο would be a very clumsy repetition of τοῦδ̣[ε] in 17, whereas when the line is taken to refer to Temenos' return to Argos it is an addition which explains why Temenos was entitled to go back to Argos: he was a descendant of Herakles. On ἀπό, which often indicates more distance in time than between father and son, cf. KG 1, 460; exceptions in e.g. *Alc.* 677 f., *HF* 826.

The fact that the exile of the Heraclids has not been mentioned before in this genealogy was regarded as "auffällig" by Siegmann ad loc. (quoted on

13-14). And indeed, it seems a little surprising, so that it would be attractive to have at least a remote reference to the usurpation of Sthenelos in 13f. (see comm.). On the other hand, the story may have been known well enough to make such an addition superfluous. However this may be, there seems to be no reason to believe with Siegmann: "Offenbar war von diesen Vorgängen in einer späteren Szene ausführlich die Rede". On p. 8 of his introduction Siegmann offers arguments for a repetition of certain themes from the prologue later on in the play, but all this is very hypothetical and seems to be inspired by an, I think unjustified, desire for mythographical exactness. The only thing for which we have some evidence that it was repeated later on is the descendance from Herakles, which apparently gave Kisseus the idea for his request (cf. test. 7, 4f.).

19 ἀπαιδίαι χρώμενος: = ἄπαις ὤν; for this expression — which is quite a common type of periphrasis — cf. e.g. *Med.* 347 συμφορᾶι κεχρημένους, *IA* 88 ἀπλοίαι χρώμενοι; more examples in Siegmann ad loc. and LSJ s.v. χράω C III 1. Siegmann ad loc. also considers the possibility that we should take χρώμενος as 'oraculum petens' and read ἀπαιδίας, but (1) this is palaeographically unlikely, (2) the single gen. cannot be thus used; Siegmann refers to KG 1, 363 c, but that is not at all relevant for our passage.

Nowhere else in our sources do we find a reference to Temenos being childless at first (cf. Robert[2] 2, 665ff., Waser in Roscher 5, 355ff. [s.v. Temenos (3)]), but then this feature may be closely connected with the purpose of this play: Euripides may have invented it in order to create an opportunity for the insertion of an oracle which could predict the birth and (presumably) the future great deeds of Archelaos. Other examples of parents-*in-spe* consulting an oracle in Euripides are *Med.* 667ff. (Aigeus), *Ion* 64ff. (Kreousa and Xouthos), *Ph.* 13ff. (Laios; on Laios consulting the oracle cf. Parke-Wormell nr. 148). See also comm. on 24ff.; on prophesies and oracles in E. in general, cf. Nilsson[1] 1, 776f.

πατὴρ ἐμός: here at last we are told that the speaker is a son of Temenos; his name will be told in 25, where see comm.

20 ἐς ἁγνάς ... Δωδώνης πτύχας: cf. *Mel. Desm.* 11 (Page *GLP* 1, 112) ἁγνὰ Δωδώνης βάθρα, *Ph.* 982 σεμνὰ Δωδώνης βάθρα; other allusions to Dodona in E. are *Andr.* 885f., fr. 367, 368, 1021.

πτύχας: a reference to the mountainous area (in Epirus, SW of the modern Joannina) in which Dodona is situated. Cf. also A. *Pr.* 830 τὴν αἰπύνωτόν τ'ἀμφὶ Δωδώνην, Pi. *N.* 4, 52f. βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔξοχοι κατάκεινται / Δωδώναθεν ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἰόνιον πόρον; *Il.* 2, 750 Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον (prob. also because it was up in the mountains). On the oracle in Dodona cf. e.g. Kern in *RE* 5, 1905, 1257-64 (s.v. Dodona [1]); Nilsson[1] 1, 423-7; Pötscher 113-147; Parke 1-163 (129ff. esp. on the oracular responses in literature); on Dione also Escher in *RE* 5, 1905, 878ff. (s.v. Dione). Excava-

tions in Dodona have brought to light lead tablets from the late sixth-mid third century B.C. (cf. Parke 100ff.), some of which contain questions about children, cf. e.g. G. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 3, Lipsiae 1920^3, nr. 1160.

21-22 τέκνων ἔρωτι: read by Maas apud Siegmann, who compared A. *Pr.* 865 μίαν δὲ παίδων ἵμερος θέλξει. But as the text of Aeschylus is better interpreted differently (see comm. on 4), I would rather compare *Ion* 67 ἔρωτι παίδων (also mentioned by Siegmann), where the context too is very similar to our passage: *Ion* 64ff. χρόνια δὲ cπείρας λέχη / ἄτεκνός ἐcτι (sc. Xouthos) καὶ Κρέουc'· ὧν οὕνεκα / ἥκουcι πρὸc μαντεῖ' Ἀπόλλωνοc τάδε / ἔρωτι παίδων. Like here we find in the passage from the *Ion* first the 'objective' statement that Xouthos and Kreousa have no children and then the visit to the oracle is mentioned and motivated 'subjectively' by their desire for children. For the expression cf. further *Med.* 714f. ἔρωc ... παίδων, *Ion* 1227 παίδων γὰρ ἐλθοῦc' εἰc ἔρον.

τῆc δ'ὁμωνύμου Διὸc / ... Διώνηc: ὁμώνυμοc is only here attested in tragedy (A. *Th.* 984 is corrupt). Siegmann ad loc. seems to regard it as an adjective; the adj. is normally constructed with a dat., but occasionally we find it with a gen. (cf. KG 1, 432 Anm. 2: "Auch bei anderen Adjektiven dieser Art erscheint zuweilen der Genetiv, wenn der Begriff der Zugehörigkeit in der Vordergrund tritt"; so e.g. Isoc. 9, 18). The subst. ὁ/ἡ ὁμώνυμοc + gen. however is far more common (e.g. Pl. *Sph.* 218 b 3 τὸν Cωκράτουc μὲν ὁμώνυμον; cf. LSJ s.v. II), so that I would rather take τῆc ὁμωνύμου Διόc here as a subst. and regard it as standing in apposition with Διώνηc. That an apposition stands before the word with which it goes is not at all unusual, cf. in this fragment 14f.; KG 1, 282, 2; Schwyzer 2, 615. On ὁμώνυμοc cf. also L. P. Rank, *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus*, Diss. Utrecht 1951, 140f.

The etymological explanation of the name Dione which is here given is right, as Διώνη is formed from the element ΔιϜ- which we also find in the oblique cases of the name Ζεύc. The fem. suffix -ώνη also appears in Ἀκριcιώνη (= Danae) in *Il.* 14, 319, Ἀργειώ[νη]c̣ (= Helena) in Hes. fr. 23 (a) 20, Ἠλεκτρυώνηι (= Alkmene) in [Hes.] *Sc.* 86 (also claimed for *Alc.* 839 by Wilamowitz [Hermes 14, 1879, 457 = id.^{4} V 2, 4], but see Dale ad loc.) and Καδμειώνη (= Semele) in *IG* XIV 1389 I 59. Cf. Pötscher 135ff.; E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin/New York 1974, 101; Schwyzer 1, 479 gives an example of a similar pair of names in old-ind. (Indra-Indrāṇī; cf. also Juppiter-Juno). For other ancient explanations of the name Dione cf. *EM* s.v. Διώνη (280, 41ff. Gaisford), which apart from the right explanation mentions several others (e.g. Διώνη derived from διδῶ, διεύνη, διαίνεcθαι). See further Escher in *RE* 5, 1905, 878-880 (s.v. Dione). On etymologies in Euripides in general cf. Nestle[1] 430f. n. 88 (many

examples); J. R. Wilson, *The etymology in Euripides 'Troades' 13-14*, AJPh 89, 1968, 66-71; Kannicht on *Hel.* 13-15; Collard on *Su.* 496-7a (who gives further literature).

πρόπολος: often used for a servant in a temple or interpreter of the will of the gods (cf. LSJ s.v. I 2). Here it is probably a female priest as in *Mel. Desm.* 11 ff. (Page *GLP* 1, 112) ἀμφὶ δ'ἁγνὰ Δωδώνης βάθρα / φηγῶι παρ' ἱερᾶι θῆλυ τὰς Διὸς φρένας / γένος πορεύει τοῖς θέλουσιν Ἑλλάδος. We find female priests in Dodona recorded from Hdt. 2, 55 onwards; cf. also S. *Tr.* 171 f., F 456 and E. fr. 368 + context. On female priests in Dodona see further Parke 69 ff. (good arguments against those who thought that they were especially connected with the cult of Dione, basing themselves on Strabo 7, 7, 12 p. 329 C, among them Jebb, S. *Tr.* p. 203); Nilsson[1] 1, 425 (who believed in influence of Delphi; cf. also Parke 76).

22 ff. εἶπε ... τάδε: the words of the priestess are given in *oratio recta* apparently with the purpose to make the oracle a prominent feature in the prologue (cf. also Stoessl[1] 67, id.[2] 2341) and to create an impression of authenticity. We may compare *IT* 17 ff. (prophecy of Kalchas) and *Ph.* 17 ff. (oracle on the birth of Oidipus). Apart from the similarity of purpose, these speeches are also comparable from a formal point of view: both begin with a rather elaborate address which reminds one of 23: *IT* 17 f. ὦ τῆσδ' ἀνάσσων Ἑλλάδος στρατηγίας, / Ἀγάμεμνον and *Ph.* 17 ὦ Θήβαισιν εὐίπποις ἄναξ. Méridier 64 f. criticizes both addresses as superfluous ornaments, but this type of address is found quite often in oracular responses and seems to belong to the 'genre'. Cf. Fontenrose 177 and in Parke-Wormell e.g. the nrs. 111, 1 Ἐργῖνε Κλυμένοιο πάϊ Πρεσβωνιάδαο; 154, 1 Αἰγεΐδη Θησεῦ, Πιτθηίδος ἔκγονε κούρης; 228, 1 Χείρωνος φίλε τέκνον ἀγακλειτοῖο Κάρυστε; 3, 1; 55, 1; 100, 1; 372, 1 etc. Actually, the remains of our oracle show much similarity of structure with the responses of the Delphic oracle, as analyzed by Fontenrose 174 ff.: the salutation in 23 ('component A', cf. Fontenrose 177); a short allusion to the problem with παῖδ' in 24 ('B', cf. Fontenrose 177 f.); the "assertion of mantic authority" in 24 ('C', cf. Fontenrose 178 f.) and the command in 25 ('E', cf. Fontenrose 179).

We also find *oratio recta* in prologue-speeches in *Heracl.* 29 f. and *Ion* 29 ff.; cf. Méridier 63 ff., Schmid *GGL* I 3, 777 n. 4; Ludwig 31 + n. 1 ('epic' feature; common in messenger-speeches, rare in prologue).

23 πεφυκὼς ἐκ γονῶν Ἡρακλέους: Siegmann ad loc. remarks that πεφυκέναι ἐκ is rare, e.g. *Heracl.* 325, S. *OT* 458. In itself ἐκ with verbs of being born or descending from is of course quite common (cf. KG 1, 460).

γονῶν: the normal meaning of the word is 'offspring'; Siegmann ad loc. says that here it must be 'son' (sc. Hyllos), but I think that Euripides may well have chosen the vaguer word γοναί deliberately: no further attention needs to be drawn to the shortening of the genealogy in 17.

24ff. The priestess now announces the birth of Archelaos and it is very likely that she went on to explain why he must be called so, and perhaps to tell something about his future career. Similar prophecies in Greek literature are *hVen.* 191 ff. (Aphrodite tells Anchises about the birth and future of Aineias and explains his name), Pi. *I.* 6, 52 ff. (a prophet promises Telamon the birth of a son and tells him to call the child Aias). For examples of oracular responses on matters of childbirth from the Delphic oracle cf. Parke-Wormell nrs. 6, 43, 110, 111, 148, 156, 185, 190, 322, 324, 334, 406.

δίδωcι: the present tense is very often used in oracles and prophecies of things which are going to happen in the future. The speaker seems to see it all happen already. Cf. e.g. A. *Ag.* 126, E. *Hipp.* 47, *Ion* 1585, Ar. *Eq.* 176 ff.; KG 1, 138 a; Schwyzer 2, 273, 4; Wackernagel 1, 161 f.

ἐγὼ μαντεύομαι: these words, said in parenthesis, are apparently added to heighten the impact of the oracle. For similar—asyndetically inserted—parentheses cf. e.g. *Med.* 93 f. οὐδὲ παύcεται / χόλου, cάφ' οἶδα, πρὶν καταcκῆψαί τινα, 963 and 1066 cάφ' οἶδ' ἐγώ, *Alc.* 1042 αἰτοῦμαί c'; Schmid *GGL* I 3, 805 f.

ἐγώ is perhaps emphatic: 'If *I* tell you this, you can be sure that it will happen!'.

μαντεύομαι: the verb can be used absolutely of the activities of a prophet (so e.g. *Od.* 2, 170 οὐ γὰρ ἀπείρητοc μαντεύομαι [Halitherses], 9, 510 [Telemos], A. *Eu.* 33 [Pythia], E. *Ph.* 840 [Teiresias]), but must here refer to the actual prophecy that Zeus will give Temenos a child: therefore sc. τοῦτο.

25 Ἀρχ[έλ]αον: Archelaos is rather late in telling his name, but of course it comes naturally here at the end of the genealogy, where he has reached the point where his own birth is announced. Cf. *Or.* 23, where Elektra too mentions her name only when it is her turn to be born, and *El.* 34 ff. where the farmer reveals his identity only at the moment when he comes into the story. We cannot quite compare *Heracl.* 30 (Iolaos' identity has been clear from 6 ff.), *Hel.* 22 (from 16 ff. we know who this lady is). The usual practice in E.'s earlier plays is that the name of the prologue-speaker is told near the beginning of his rhesis, in his later plays it often comes late; cf. Ludwig 32 f.

The way in which Euripides lets Archelaos tell his name is quite skilful. Cf. *Heracl.* 28 ff., where he also used *oratio recta* to make the name of the prologue-speaker known to the audience: μή τιc ὧδ' εἴπῃ βροτῶν· / Ἴδεcθ', ἐπειδὴ παιcὶν οὐκ ἔcτιν πατήρ, / Ἰόλαοc οὐκ ἤμυνε cυγγενὴc γεγώc. The device was already old; cf. *Od.* 6, 275 f. where Nausikaa uses it in order to make herself known to Odysseus: καί νύ τιc ὧδ' εἴπῃcι κακώτεροc ἀντιβολήcαc· / Τίc δ' ὅδε Ναυcικάαι ἕπεται καλόc τε μέγαc τε / ξεῖνοc; On the ways in which Euripides made the identities of his prologue-speakers known see further Méridier 138 ff.

After καλεῖν Siegmann read cε, but was doubtful about this reading. If this

is what was written we can compare e.g. *IT* 22ff. (Kalchas to Agamemnon:) παῖδ' ..., ἣν χρή cε θῦcαι. However, the traces in the papyrus do not seem to favour this reading and it may well be that καλεῖν was immediately followed by e.g. the explanation of the name. It should be noticed that, although χρή + acc. cum inf. is much more common than χρή + inf., ςε̣ in our passage could be felt as somewhat redundant, because the subject of the inf. has already been indicated by c[οι] in 24; cf. similar constructions in e.g. *Od.* 3, 208f. ἀλλ' οὔ μοι τοιοῦτον ἐπέκλωcαν θεοὶ ὄλβον, / πατρί τ'ἐμῶι καὶ ἐμοί· νῦν δὲ χρὴ τετλάμεν ἔμπηc, A. *Pr.* 293ff. οὐδὲ μάτην / χαριτογλωccεῖν ἔνι μοι· φέρε γὰρ /cήμαιν' ὅ τι χρή coι cυμπράccειν, E. *HF* 140ff.

*fr. 229 = 3 A

This fragment was attributed to the *Archelaos* by Musgrave (3, 607) because of the address to Kisseus it contains: "Cissei personae locum in Archelao fuisse docebit Hyginus". One might add that not only the presence of Kisseus suggests the *Archelaos*, but especially the combination of his name with the words πεδίον πυρὶ μαρμαίρει, which recall test. 7, 2 *qui* (sc. Kisseus) *cum a finitimis oppugnaretur*. The fragment, which is in recited anapaests has been generally regarded as being part of the parodos[1] together with fr. 230 (cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 702, Van Herwerden[2] 326, Siegmann 8, Webster 255, Lowicka 266). The fragments are not only in the same metre (which in itself would be undecisive), but they also deal with the same subject: the bad situation into which the speakers' country has got, apparently because of a war. As it was important for a right understanding of the play that this situation was explained early, it is indeed very likely that both fragments are from the parodos. If so, it may well be that the chorus (whose identity we do not know with certainty; see intr. 2.2) have come to tell their king about their difficulties and the impending disasters, at the same time describing them for the convenience of the audience. Cf. the very similar situation in A. *Th.* 78ff. On the habit of Euripides of starting his plays with a rather critical situation, which may still become worse, see Schmid *GGL* I 3, 780.

If we are right in supposing that frs. 229 and 230 are from an account of the war given in the parodos a close parallel may be *Hec.* 98-153 which apart from the similarity of metre also seems comparable in that it tells about certain events off-stage (i.e. the Greek decision to kill Polyxena); Grube 109 remarks that "this experiment is nowhere repeated", but perhaps there was something similar in the *Archelaos*. Anapaests in the parodos may have been

---

[1] In this discussion I let this term cover the anapaestic prelude, the parodos proper and anapaestic utterances by the chorus which may follow it.

a deliberate archaism; cf. Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 40-103; H. W. Schmidt in Jens, 11 ff.

As the position of fr. 229 within the parodos bears some relevance to the reconstruction of the prologue, it may be worth a brief discussion. There are, I think, two possibilities: (1) it is from the prelude to the parodos proper. This is regarded as certain by Siegmann 8, and the address of Kisseus could be paralleled from *Hec.* 98 Ἑκάβη, cπουδῆι πρόc c'ἐλιάcθην at the beginning of the parodos; cf. also S. *Aj.* 133 f. Τελαμώνιε παῖ, τῆc ἀμφιρύτου / Cαλαμῖνοc ἔχων βάθρον ἀγχιάλου, *El.* 121 f. In all these instances the person who is addressed has been on stage for some time already and is known to the audience, i.e. the address does not serve as an introduction. A drawback of the idea is perhaps that the chorus here seem to begin their account of the situation rather abruptly, without explaining why and whence they turn up and who they are, but as we possess nothing of the context this cannot really be used as an argument; (2) it is from the end of the parodos, which would imply that Kisseus came on stage only after the parodos. This view was defended by Webster 255; Lowicka 266. Anapaests announcing somebody's first arrival are found several times in Euripides; cf. especially *El.* 988-97 βαcίλεια γύναι χθονὸc Ἀργείαc, / παῖ Τυνδάρεω etc.; cf. also *Andr.* 494-500; *Or.* 348-55 (and for announcements of first or later arrivals which do not contain a voc. or second pers. sg.: *Hipp.* 170 ff., 1342 ff., *Andr.* 1226 ff., *Su.* 980 ff., *Tr.* 230 ff., 568 ff., *El.* 1233 ff., *HF* 442 ff.); Manning 53 ff. These examples show that it was quite common to have someone's arrival announced in anapaests by the chorus; on the nature of such arrivals, which are usually slow or pompous, cf. Taplin 73 f. (who gives more examples). However, in these passages the anapaests contain merely the announcement + a short introduction and sometimes the question: 'why does she/he come?'. There is nothing comparable to our πεδίον πυρὶ μαρμαίρει, which to me suggests the beginning of a longer account. Only A. *Ag.* 782 ff., where the first arrival of Agamemnon is announced ἄγε δὴ βαcιλεῦ, Τροίαc πτολίπορθ', / Ἀτρέωc γένεθλον + anapaests until 809, may be somewhat comparable. Also it would be difficult to see where fr. 230 comes in, if we place fr. 229 near the end of the parodos.

I am inclined to find (2) more problematic than (1), but probably the safest course is to admit that we cannot know the position of fr. 229 with certainty. So also Stoessl² 234 f.

1 χώραc: i.e. Thrace; see comm. on test. 7, 1 *in Thraciam*. Kisses is attested as king of Thrace as early as *Il.* 11, 221 ff. Ἰφιδάμαc ..., / ὃc τράφη ἐν Θρήικηι ἐριβώλακι, ...· / Κιccῆc (Κιccεὺc *b e f p*) τόν γ' ἔθρεψε; for Kisseus see Servius on Verg. *A.* 5, 535 *Cisseus, rex Thraciae, secundum Vergilium pater Hecubae* (cf. E. *Hec.* 3 and Servius on Verg. *A.* 7, 320; 10, 705); Stoll in Roscher II 1, 1206 (s.v. Kisses and Kisseus [1]). With Kisseus

thus attested as king of Thrace in independent sources, there is no reason to assume with Pohlenz 2, 180 that Euripides called him after Keisos, another son of Temenos (on whom see Capelle in *RE* 11, 1922, 117 [s.v. Keisos]).

πολυβώλου: 'with large clods, fruitful' (LSJ). This word, which is not attested elsewhere (only Cypr. fr. 6, 11 [p. 24 Kinkel] has ἀν' ἤπειρον πολυβώλακα) seems to have been coined after the epic ἐρίβωλοϲ/ἐριβῶλαξ which is used also of Thrace in *Il.* 11, 222 ἐν Θρήικηι ἐριβώλακι, μητέρι μήλων. Cf. also *Or.* 1382 f. καλλίβωλον Ἴδαϲ ὄροϲ ἱερόν, *Rh.* 921 γῆϲ χρυϲόβωλον ... λέπαϲ.

2 Κιϲϲεῦ: see comm. on 1.

πεδίον πυρὶ μαρμαίρει: πεδίον very probably is the plain around the capital of Kisseus and as the chorus is here describing the circumstances of the war (as has been argued above), it seems likely that the account of the chorus contained elements reminiscent of the scenes in A. *Th.* 78 ff. (where the chorus describes the Argive army outside the town) and E. *Ph.* 88 ff. (Antigone and the paidagogos watching the Argive army in the plain around Thebes). This kind of 'teichoscopy' (which we find as a literary device as early as *Il.* 3, 146 ff.) could be used as a means of making the audience acquainted with things it could not see. Cf. Groeneboom on A. *Th.* 78-180.

πυρὶ μαρμαίρει has been interpreted in different ways:

(1) πυρὶ means 'the watch-fires of the enemy'; so Welcker 2, 702; Bothe 80. Van Herwerden[2] 326 n. 2 rightly objected that the dramatic time must be day, not night. Cf. also H. W. Schmidt in Jens 38 f. who observes that no fifth-century play has night as its dramatic time, although they may start very early in the morning (only in the prologue of A. *Ag.* it is still dark, so that the fire-signal can be seen);

(2) the enemies are setting everything around the city on fire; so Van Herwerden[2] 327. But it is very unlikely that μαρμαίρειν could be used in this sense (see below);

(3) it indicates the flashing light caused by the hostile arms reflecting the sunlight, so apparently Austin 15 (who compares Alc. fr. 357, 1 L-P μαρμαίρει δὲ μέγαϲ δόμοϲ χάλκωι) and Bond on *Hyps.* fr. I, II 31. This interpretation must, I think, be right: (a) μαρμαίρειν is exactly the right word to describe such sparkling light (cf. LSJ s.v. '*flash*, *sparkle*, *gleam*, of any *darting*, *quivering* light'; Schmidt *Syn.* 1, 582 "μαρμαίρειν, auch μαρμαρίζειν, etwa *funkeln*, ist der eigentliche Ausdruck für den Glanz polirten Metalles .... Es ist immer der dem Gegenstande eigene erhöhte und das Auge erfreuende Glanz"; cf. also E. Handschnur, *Die Farb- und Glanzwörter bei Homer und Hesiod, in den homerischen Hymnen und den Fragmenten des epischen Kyklos*, Diss. Wien 1970, 80 ff.). In the *Iliad* it is often used of shining armour, cf. e.g. *Il.* 12, 195 ἔντεα μαρμαίροντα, 13, 801 χαλκῶι μαρμαίροντεϲ (more examples in Handschnur o.c. 81 n. 6); similarly Alc. fr. 357 L-P (quoted above); of

other things e.g. Hes. *Th.* 699 (lightning), B. fr. *20 B 13 (gold and ivory), A. *Th.* 401 (stars), E. *Ion* 888 (Apollo's hair); (b) a plain thus being aglow with arms seems to have been a literary topos: cf. *Il.* 20, 156f. τῶν δ'ἅπαν ἐπλήcθη πεδίον καὶ λάμπετο χαλκῶι, / ἀνδρῶν ἠδ' ἵππων; E. *Ph.* 110f. κατάχαλκον ἅπαν / πεδίον ἀcτράπτει, *Hyps.* I, II 30f. ἀc[τ]ράπ[τ]ει χαλκέο[ι]cιν ὅπλο[ιc / Ἀργεῖον π[ε]δίον πᾶ[ν; for more examples cf. R. Goossens, Latomus 5, 1946, 283; (c) we do sometimes find the shining of armour compared to the glow of fire: *Il.* 18, 610 θώρηκα φαεινότερον πυρὸc αὐγῆc, 22, 134f. ἀμφὶ δὲ χαλκὸc ἐλάμπετο εἴκελοc αὐγῆι / ἢ πυρὸc αἰθομένου ἢ ἠελίου ἀνιόντοc, [Hes.] *Sc.* 60 τεύχεcι λαμπομένουc cέλαc ὥc πυρὸc αἰθομένοιο, I *Macc.* 6, 39 ὡc δὲ ἔcτιλβεν ὁ ἥλιοc ἐπὶ τὰc χρυcᾶc καὶ χαλκᾶc ἀcπίδαc, ἔcτιλβεν τὰ ὄρη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ κατηύγαζεν ὡc λαμπάδεc πυρόc. Admittedly our fragment is much less explicit than these examples, but then it may well be that the following line(s) made the idea more clear. Very concise is also *Ph.* 250f. ἀμφὶ δὲ πτόλιν νέφοc / ἀcπίδων πυκνὸν φλέγει.

fr. 230 = 4 A

For the location of this fragment see the intr. to fr. 229.

1 γὰρ: perhaps motivating a request for help? Cf. S. *OT* 22ff. which give the reasons why the supplicants ask Oidipus for help: πόλιc γάρ, ὥcπερ καὐτὸc εἰcορᾷc, ἄγαν / ἤδη cαλεύει κἀνακουφίcαι κάρα / βυθῶν ἔτ' οὐχ οἵα τε φοινίου cάλου.

ὑπερθεῖν κύματοc ἄκραν: a maritime metaphor such as E. was very fond of using; cf. *Vita Eur.* 5 (1, 5, 1-2 Schwartz); E. E. Pot, *De maritieme beeldspraak bij Euripides*, Diss. Utrecht 1943. κῦμα is here used in the sense 'the waves of adversity' (cf. LSJ s.v. κῦμα 2 b), for which cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 824 ἐκπερᾶcαι κῦμα τῆcδε cυμφορᾶc, *Ion* 927 κακῶν ... κῦμ' ὑπεξαντλῶν φρενί; A. *Th.* 758, *Pr.* 885f. (on the development of the metaphor in A. see Van Nes 34ff.). In these examples κῦμα is accompanied by something like κακῶν or cυμφορᾶc which helps to explain the metaphor, but as it was a common metaphor, the idea could also be expressed by a simple κῦμα or πέλαγοc; cf. S. *OC* 1746 μέγ'ἄρα πέλαγοc ἐλαχέτην τι (cf. Jebb ad loc. and Groeneboom on A. *Pr.* 746; on the decay of the metaphor also Wilamowitz on *HF* 1087, but contra Bond on *HF* 1087f.) and the use of the adj. ἄκυμοc in *HF* 698ff. τὸν ἄκυμον / θῆκεν βίοτον βροτοῖc / πέρcαc δείματα θηρῶν. Here too we find κῦμα without further qualification, but unambiguous because of the context.

ἄκραν: the 'top of the wave', cf. LSJ s.v. ἄκρα 3, who mention only our fragment.

ὑπερθεῖν: 'to get over the top of the waves', i.e. to hold the ship with its front towards the waves so that they carry it over their crest. Cf. Van Nes 155. If one is not able to hold one's ship like this it will obviously get filled with water and sink.

It has been generally thought that this fragment contains a reminiscence of (1) Thgn. 619 f. πόλλ' ἐν ἀμηχανίηιcι κυλίνδομαι ἀχνύμενοc κῆρ· / ἄκρην γὰρ πενίην οὐχ ὑπερεδράμομεν ≅ 1114 a-b (but 1114 b starts with ἀρχὴν γὰρ πενίηc ...) (on reminiscences of Thgn. in Euripides, which appear not to be very frequent, see A. Garzya, *Euripide e Teognide*, RFIC 36, 1958, 225-239) and (2) A. *Eu.* 560 ff. γελᾶι δὲ δαίμων ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ θερμῶι, / τὸν οὔποτ' αὐχοῦντ' ἰδὼν ἀμηχάνοιc / δύαιc λαπαδνὸν οὐδ' ὑπερθέοντ' ἄκραν, which in its turn may be a reminiscence of Thgn. In both passages the meaning of ἄκρην/ἄκραν is disputed. In Theognis it is now usually regarded as 'the top of the waves', cf. Van Nes 155 n. 3 and Van Groningen ad loc., who compares such expressions as *Il.* 13. 523 ἄκρωι 'Ολύμπωι. On A. opinions are more divided: 'the top of the waves' is favoured by e.g. Thomson on A. *Eu.* 565, 'cape, headland' by e.g. Groeneboom ad loc. and Van Nes 154 ff., who finds that this fits in better with ἕρμα, δίνα and προcβαλών in the context. Now the expression ἄκραν ὑπερθεῖν may have been more common than we are able to see, in which case we need not to assume a reminiscence, but in any case it is unlikely that ἄκραν ὑπερθεῖν should mean different things in the various passages. So I would infer from Euripides' κύματοc ἄκραν that it was 'the top of the waves' in Theognis and Aeschylus too.

2 ἔτι: 'still', which seems to indicate that this war had been going on for some time already.

θάλλει: here used of the flourishing of a bad thing (Breitenbach 143 translates it with 'vorhanden sein', but that is too weak); θάλλω, ἀνθέω and ἄνθοc are often thus used in Greek poetry. Cf. for θάλλω e.g. B. 15, 58 f. θάλλουc' ἀθαμβὴc / Ὕβριc, A. *Ag.* 1144 f. Ἴτυν Ἴτυν cτένουc' ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοῖc / ἀηδὼν μόρον, *Suppl.* 105 ff., S. *El.* 258 ff. πατρῶι' ... πήματ' ... / θάλλοντα μᾶλλον ἢ καταφθίνοντ' ὁρῶ (cf. Kamerbeek on 260), *Ph.* 258 f., E. *Ph.* 811 f. δυcδαίμων δ'ἔριc ἄλλα / θάλλει παίδων. For ἀνθέω, ἄνθοc etc. cf. Solon fr. 4, 35 West, A. *Th.* 951 f., *Ag.* 659, *Ch.* 1009; S. *Ant.* 959 f. (where see Jebb), *Tr.* 998 f., 1089 f.; no instances in E.

πενία: 'lack of prosperity', 'poverty', probably caused by the war and affecting the whole city, here contrasted with the ὄλβοc of happier days (3 φεύγει δ' ὄλβοc). For poverty as a result of war cf. e.g. Isoc. 8, 19 ὁ μὲν τοίνυν πόλεμοc ἁπάντων ἡμᾶc τῶν εἰρημένων ἀπεcτέρηκεν· καὶ γὰρ πενεcτέρουc ἐποίηcε (of Athens impoverished by war); Ar. *Pax* 119 ff. (no bread and money left in Trygaios' house because of the war); and for contrast cf. *Kresph.* fr. 453, 1 with my comm.

πενία / κακὸν ἔχθιcτον: cf. Alc. fr. 364 L-P ἀργάλεον Πενία κάκον ἄcχετον; for derogatory remarks on πενία see further Hemelrijk 66 ff.

3 φεύγει: *praesens pro perfecto*; cf. KG 1, 136 b. Of abstractions also (but with an object) *Andr.* 345 f. κακὸν πόcιν / φεύγει τὸ ταύτηc cῶφρον; fr. 322, 1 ff. ἔρωc ... / φεύγει ... μόχθουc.

ὄλβος: for wealth connected with peace, and war and στάσις connected with poverty see comm. on *Kresph.* fr. 453, 1 and 10. The contrast πενία-ὄλβος is often found in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Su.* 176, *HF* 588 f., 647 f., fr. 326, 6 f., 641, 2 f. On ὄλβος in Euripides cf. De Heer 70 f. (who observes that "the primary sense component is possession"); McDonald 297 and 304 f. ("ὄλβιος most frequently describes material prosperity in Euripides").

fr. 231 = 5 A

As to the location of this fragment in the play it is generally assumed that it belongs in a dialogue between Archelaos and Kisseus, early in the play (cf. test. 7, 1 ff.). This seems quite possible, as the fragment contains the type of question that is most likely to be asked at an early confrontation (see comm. on 1). If so, the fragment could have stood before as well as after the parodos, all depending on when Kisseus appeared on stage.

As to the division of these two lines over two speakers opinions have differed. If it is from a dialogue Kisseus-Archelaos there are theoretically four possibilities:

(1) 1 Archelaos, 2 Kisseus; so Welcker 2, 703; Van Herwerden[2] 328; Austin 15: "Archelaus, ut vid., Cisseum adloquitur";

(2) 1 Kisseus, 2 Archelaos; so Nauck ad loc.; Lowicka 267;

(3) both lines are spoken by Archelaos;

(4) both lines are spoken by Kisseus; so Siegmann 8 n. 22; Webster 255 f.

Now (2) and (3) do not seem likely to be right, as one would expect that πατέρων ... ἐσθλῶν in the *Archelaos* refers to the ancestors of Archelaos and not to those of Kisseus (see comm. below); in case of (3) and (4) 1, in which the prominent ἡμῶν must be stressing some surprise of Archelaos or Kisseus at being asked for help, would be irrelevant for the purpose of the quotation (which is to illustrate that children of noble parents are εὐγενεῖς): it seems to be essential for the unity of the quotation that ἡμῶν and the subject of 2 are the same person. Besides, if the two lines are by one speaker it is difficult to see how they are connected: one would have to paraphrase something like 'Why do you need us? For you (yourself) raise expectations (that you are well able to manage your own affairs?)', which is obviously rather forced. I think these objections are fatal to (3) and (4). In case of (1), 1 could be a reaction of Archelaos to a request of Kisseus for help, the prominent position of ἡμῶν indicating his surprise that he, an exile, is being asked for help; in 2 Kisseus then explains why he asked the help of Archelaos: he finds his noble ancestry promising. This interpretation seems to account best for the text as we have it and I therefore prefer it to the other three.

For connection of fr. 232, 3-4 with this fragment see comm. on fr. 232.

1 ἡμῶν: the word-order in this line is irregular in that ἡμῶν is preceding τί

δῆτα; cf. Denniston 271. This position seems to give ἡμῶν a certain emphasis, well fitted to express the speaker's surprise at being asked for something (cf. also Van Herwerden² 328 n. 1). In a similar way we find δῆτα only postponed in e.g. S. *Aj.* 1360 τοιούcδ' ἐπαινεῖc δῆτα cὺ κτᾶcθαι φίλουc; *El.* 1037 τῶι cῶι δικαίωι δῆτ' ἐπιcπέcθαι με δεῖ; E. *El.* 834 φυγάδοc δῆτα δειμαίνειc δόλον; (more examples in Denniston 271), where the preceding words also have a certain emphasis. I have found no other examples of τί δῆτα being thus postponed.

τί δῆτα: the question seems to be first of all informative; cf. (1) the examples of similar contexts quoted below on χρείαν ἔχων, and (2) my interpretation of 2 γάρ. Still, it is worth noticing that τί δῆτα-questions are often rhetoric and can be virtually equivalent to a negative statement; cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 56 (esp. p. 34 n. 14). Here too the notion 'Surely you have no need of *us*?' may be present in the background.

χρείαν ἔχων: we find the expression χρείαν ἔχω + gen. a few times in what seem to be similar contexts: E. *Su.* 114f. (Adrastos:) Θηcεῦ, cὸc ἱκέτηc καὶ πόλεωc ἥκω cέθεν. / (Theseus:) τί χρῆμα θηρῶν καὶ τίνοc χρείαν ἔχων; Ar. *Th.* 179f. (Euripides:) ἐγὼ δὲ καινῆι cυμφορᾶι πεπληγμένοc / ἱκέτηc ἀφῖγμαι πρὸc cέ. / (Agathon:) τοῦ χρείαν ἔχων; Our fragment too may well have been preceded by something like: "I want to ask you for something".

2 γάρ: if there is a change of speaker between 1 and 2 it is best to take γάρ as answering τί, as in e.g. *Heracl.* 708 ff. (Alk.:) τί χρῆμα μέλλειc ... / λιπεῖν μ' ἔρημον cὺν τέκνοιc ἐμοῖc; / (Iol.:) ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἀλκή·, *Hel.* 1229f. (Hel.:) τί κερτομεῖc με, τὸν θανόντα δ' οὐκ ἐᾶιc; / (Theokl.:) πιcτὴ γὰρ εἶ cὺ cῶι πόcει φεύγουcά με.

πατέρων ... ἐcθλῶν: there can be little doubt that, in the *Archelaos*, this refers to the ancestors of Archelaos and not of Kisseus or anybody else. Cf. also the allusions in frs. 232, 233 and the long genealogy in fr. 228 + 2 A: one gets the impression that the noble ancestry of Archelaos was a kind of *Leitmotiv* in the play. Siegmann 8 n. 22 regards fr. 231 as part of an elaborate repetition of parts of the genealogy from the prologue-rhesis, necessary because the king had not heard it. There is nothing in the text, however, which justifies this conclusion, and repetition of much of the genealogy seems very unlikely, though, of course, Archelaos must have told Kisseus, that he was a descendant of Herakles (see comm. on fr. 2, 18 A).

ἐλπίδαc δίδωc: for the expression cf. fr. 404 τό τ' εὐγενὲc / πολλὴν δίδωcιν ἐλπίδ' ὡc ἄρξουcι γῆc, *Hel.* 1037f. ἐcφέρειc γὰρ ἐλπίδαc / ὡc δή τι δράcων χρηcτόν, *Med.* 1032f.; here too ἐλπίδαc may have been further explained by a subordinate clause or an adj. in the next line.

At the background of this fragment is obviously the idea that a noble character was the inheritance of noble ancestors. This idea, which is also well illustrated by the fact that εὐγενήc in tragedy can denote both a noble birth

and a noble character (cf. LSJ s.v.), we find expressed often in Sophocles, cf. e.g. *Aj.* 1304 f. ἄριστος ἐξ ἀριστέοιν δυοῖν / βλαστών, *Ph.* 874 f. ἀλλ' εὐγενὴς γὰρ ἡ φύσις κἀξ εὐγενῶν, / ὦ τέκνον, ἡ σή, 719 f.; in Euripides cf. fr. 75 ὦ παῖ Κρέοντος, ὡς ἀληθὲς ἦν ἄρα, / ἐσθλῶν ἀπ'ἀνδρῶν ἐσθλὰ γίγνεσθαι τέκνα, / κακῶν δ'ὅμοια τῆι φύσει τῆι τοῦ πατρός; cf. also X. *Mem.* 2, 1, 27; Arist. *Rh.* 1367 b 30-31; but differently *Od.* 2, 276 f. For bad qualities as an inheritance from one's parents cf. e.g. S. *Ph.* 384, *OT* 1397; E. *Andr.* 590. More examples of hereditary qualities in Bruhn §263 (p. 159); cf. also Dover 91 ff. Even so, noble birth does not necessarily imply ἀρετή (cf. Adkins 190 n. 3; 191 n. 13), and one may be 'noble' without being well-born. This latter view seems to have been fairly prominent in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Ion* 854 ff., *El.* 367 ff., *Hel.* 728 ff. (where see Kannicht), *Or.* 870, fr. 336; cf. also Guthrie 154 f.

fr. 232 = 6 A

This fragment also touches upon the theme of 'noble parents'. In 1-2 it is stated that the good qualities of noble parents are transferred to their children and are worth more than a rich marriage. The speaker *may* have had in mind the proposed marriage of Archelaos and the daughter of Kisseus (the contrast ἀρετή-πλούσιος γάμος does not seem to be proverbial, which makes it likely that it alludes to the dramatic situation of the *Archelaos*).

The idea that Archelaos is somehow referred to in any case wins some support from the fact that both poverty and nobility appear among the characteristics of Archelaos (cf. the allusions to poverty in frs. 246, 249; to nobility in frs. 231, 242 and 249). These features are not at all surprising, because (1) it was only natural that Euripides should make the mythical ancestor of his host Archelaos εὐγενής, and (2) poverty was obviously one of the drawbacks of exile; cf. *Ph.* 405 (Polyneikes about his exile:) κακὸν τὸ μὴ ἔχειν (later we find this as one of the topoi in treatises Περὶ φυγῆς; cf. for a survey B. Häsler, *Favorin über die Verbannung*, Berlin 1935, 28 ff.).

3-4 follow 1-2 in *M A*, but are omitted by *S*. They are now generally regarded as forming one fragment with 1-2, but although the γάρ-clause could be regarded as explaining ἐν τοῖς—ἔλαμψε, I cannot see how it connects with κρείσσων—γάμου. Some scholars have connected 3-4 with fr. 231 (so Wagner 673, H. Duentzer Phil. 5, 1850, 186 f., who read 3 ⟨πολλάς⟩· πένης—ἀπώλεσεν comparing *Med.* 1032 f., fr. 404; Van Herwerden[2] 328 f.). But this is not favoured by the manuscript tradition and, although it makes more sense than after 232, 1-2, it is not at all cogent. Musgrave 3, 551 printed fr. 231, 232, 3-4 and 232, 1-2 as three separate fragments and this seems a neat solution: surely fr. 232, 3-4 would do very well on its own (and the crux before πένης could then be removed: the quotation may very well have started with πένης).

The two quotations then may have got combined by accident (e.g. if they were not separated by a proper lemma, as is often the case; cf. Luria 85) or on purpose (it is conceivable that they were both part of the same speech and got combined for anthological purposes, for which the intervening part may not have been relevant; cf. Luria 101 f.). In the first case it becomes doubtful whether 3-4 belong to the *Archelaos* at all.

The fragment seems to me too gnomic to justify a discussion of possible locations. Attempts have been made by e.g. Welcker 2, 703, Van Herwerden[2] 328 f., Webster 256, Lowicka 268. For the thought in 1-2 cf. also Thgn. 183 ff., *El.* 1097-99.

1 For the idea that one may inherit ἀρετή from one's parents see comm. on fr. 231.

2 ἔλαμψε: the text of the mss. is obviously corrupt and several attempts have been made to correct it. The context makes it very likely that the solution has to be sought in some form of λάμπω (or a compound of it): metaphorical use of λάμπω with an abstract noun is well attested, especially in Pindar; cf. e.g. Pi. *O.* 1, 23 λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος, *I.* 1, 22 λάμπει δὲ σαφὴς ἀρετά, fr. 172, 227; also B. 8, 20 f. and in tragedy e.g. A. *Ag.* 772 Δίκα δὲ λάμπει, E. *Andr.* 775 f. ἁ δ' ἀρετὰ / καὶ θανοῦσι λάμπει, *TrGF* 2, F 500 Δίκας δ'ἐξέλαμψε θεῖον φάος.

I have printed Nauck's ἔλαμψε, which seems the most simple correction, but two of the other conjectures deserve to be considered as well: (1) Valckenaer's ἐνέλαμψε has the advantage of taking account of ἐν in *S M* (but, of course, that may have crept in from the line above); if so, it must mean something like 'shines (again) in', cf. perhaps Plu. *De audiendo* 6, 40 d ὡς γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὄμμασι τῶν πλησίον ἐλλάμποντα τὰ ἑαυτῶν ὁρῶμεν, (2) Dindorf's λέλαμπε is interesting: λέλαμπε used instead of a present would certainly be liable to get corrupted; the form seems to occur only in Euripides (cf. Schwyzer 1, 771; 2, 264, 1; and on this use of the perfect in general also KG 1, 148 f.; Wackernagel 1, 166 ff.), and there it is attested only once: *Andr.* 1024 ff. οὐδ' ἔτι πῦρ ἐπιβώμιον ἐν Τροί/αι θεοῖσιν λέλαμ/πεν καπνῶι θυώδει (λάμπει *A*, λέλαμπτε *V*), cf. Stevens ad loc.

κρείσσων: at first sight κρείσσων seems preferable to κρεῖσσον as it goes nicely with ἀρετή. Still, the use of the neuter ('a better thing') after ἀρετή could easily be paralleled; cf. e.g. *Su.* 488 πολέμου κρεῖσσον εἰρήνη βροτοῖς, fr. 7 κρεῖσσον δὲ πλούτου καὶ βαθυσπόρου χθονὸς / ἀνδρῶν δικαίων κἀγαθῶν ὁμιλίαι. Perhaps the neuter could even be defended as the *lectio difficilior* (although the variants may also be due to a simple orthographical error).

πλουσίου γάμου: i.e. 'a marriage with a rich (wo)man'. Often when E, speaks about a marriage 'with X', 'with X' is expressed by an adj. or poss. pronoun; cf. e.g. *Med.* 18 γάμοις Ἰάσων βασιλικοῖς εὐνάζεται, 547, *Hel.*

1385 f. τοὺϲ ἐμοὺϲ / γάμουϲ, *Ph.* 59, *IA* 271. On this use of the adj. cf. Breitenbach 204 ff., KG 1, 261 ff. In all these cases we find the plural γάμοι, which on the whole is more common than the sing. (cf. LSJ s.v. II). For riches unfavourably compared to another thing cf. *Or.* 1155 f., frs. 7 (quoted above), 191, 518, 1 f., 825, 1046, 1 f.

3 †πένηϲ: if a word is lost before or after πένηϲ I think that the most simple correction is ⟨ἀνὴρ⟩ πένηϲ or πένηϲ ⟨ἀνήρ⟩, which is quite a common expression in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Su.* 420 ἀνὴρ πένηϲ, 863 πένηϲ ἀνήρ, *El.* 253, fr. 327, 3. *ἀνήρ* may easily have dropped out before or after *πένηϲ* or have been felt to be superfluous; cf. for a similar case Stob. I 3, 2 (1, 53, 1 Wachsmuth) εἴ τοι νομίζειϲ ⟨ἄνδρα⟩ ϲυγγενῆ κακῶϲ / δρῶν οὐχ ὑφέξειν τὴν δίκην, οὐκ εὖ φρονεῖϲ = S. *OT* 551 f., whence ἄνδρα has been supplied, which failed in the mss. of Stobaeus. For γάρ as the third word in a sentence after noun + adj. cf. e.g. *Andr.* 764 πολλῶν νέων γὰρ, *Or.* 1244 τριϲϲοῖϲ φίλοιϲ γὰρ (Denniston 96).

ἐκεῖν': already pointing to the next line, where it is made explicit; cf. e.g. S. *Ph.* 310 f. ἐκεῖνο δ' οὐδείϲ, ἡνίκ' ἂν μνηϲθῶ, θέλει, / ϲῶϲαί μ' ἐϲ οἴκουϲ, E. *Ion* 636 f., fr. 249, 2 f. (more examples in KG 1, 658 f.).

4 τὸ ... γενναῖον: 'the character of a γενναῖοϲ, nobility' (LSJ s.v. γενναιότηϲ); cf. fr. 739, 5 τὸ τοῦ πατρὸϲ γενναῖον, fr. inc. 1066 (both in contexts similar to ours, see below), S. *OC* 569 Θηϲεῦ, τὸ ϲὸν γενναῖον. On this way of using the neuter of the adj. + def. article to indicate abstractions (i.e. τὸ γενναῖον instead of εὐγένεια or γενναιότηϲ), which became especially popular in Sophocles and Euripides, see Solmsen 110 ff.

As to the relation between money and a noble character different views are found in Euripides (which are of course adduced because they suit a certain character, as is well illustrated even by the *Archelaos*, where one may contrast the views of frs. 232, 235 and 247 with frs. 248 and 249; cf. also Guthrie 154 n. 1): (1) the view expressed in our fragment, that a man remains noble even if he becomes poor; cf. e.g. fr. 739 φεῦ φεῦ, τὸ φῦναι πατρὸϲ εὐγενοῦϲ ἄπο / ὅϲην ἔχει φρόνηϲιν ἀξίωμά τε. / κἂν γὰρ πένηϲ ὢν τυγχάνηι, χρηϲτὸϲ γεγὼϲ/τιμὴν ἔχει τιν', ἀναμετρούμενοϲ δέ πωϲ / τὸ τοῦ πατρὸϲ γενναῖον ὠφελεῖ τρόπωι (from the *Temenidai* and very similar to our fragment), fr. 1066, *Or.* 870; an illustration of this idea is also the farmer in the *Elektra*, who is impoverished (35 ff.), yet γενναῖοϲ (253), (2) the more cynical view that εὐγένεια without riches is not very useful and may disappear altogether (cf. e.g. *El.* 37 f., *Ph.* 404 f., 442, fr. 22, 95, 326, 362, 14 ff.), which fits in with the old aristocratic view that nobility and riches go together (cf. e.g. *Andr.* 766 ff.). See further on this topic in Greek literature Hemelrijk 60 ff.; Denniston on *El.* 253; H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, München 1962, 266 f.

fr. 233 = 7 A

It is clear from ὦ παῖ in 1 that these lines were spoken by an older to a younger person (on addresses with [ὦ] παῖ and [ὦ] τέκνον in E. cf. Wendel 19 f.; 98 ff.). The nature of the adhortation (for which cf. also frs. 236-240) suggests that this younger person was Archelaos. We cannot know the speaker of the fragment nor its position in the play. For some attempts at location cf. Welcker 2, 707; Lowicka 267 (both regard Kisseus as the speaker); Bothe 81, Van Herwerden[2] 330 ff., Webster 257 (who consider the fragment as part of a speech by Temenos quoted in *oratio recta*); other candidates could be the chorus or the old slave.

For the idea that πόνοι create success and other good things, which was apparently a theme of some importance in the *Archelaos* (cf. also frs. 236-240; Seeck 583), cf. *Su.* 323 (where see Collard), *Alexandros* fr. 63 Snell; fr. 364, 474, 1052, 7.

1 εἶπον: for the aor. cf. perhaps *Med.* 271 ff. (Kreon:) cὲ τὴν cκυθρωπὸν καὶ πόcει θυμουμένην, / Μήδειαν, εἶπον τῆcδε γῆc ἔξω περᾶν / φυγάδα (where Page accepts Harrison's Μήδει', ἀνεῖπον) and KG 1, 164 f.: "Endlich können auch Verben des Sagens, des Befehlens, des Anratens, des Schwörens, obwohl sie auf die Gegenwart bezogen werden, durch den Aorist ausgesprochen werden, wenn der Ausspruch als ein unabänderlicher, ein für allemal gültiger nachdrücklich bezeichnet werden soll", where more examples are given. Cf. also Kannicht on *Hel.* 330; Collard on *Su.* 1161.

ἐκ τῶν πόνων: ἐκ used instrumentally (cf. KG 1, 461, Schwyzer 2, 463 f.) as in e.g. Hes. *Op.* 308 ἐξ ἔργων δ'ἄνδρες πολύμηλοί τ'ἀφνειοί τε, Pi. *N.* 9, 44 ἐκ πόνων δ', οἳ cὺν νεότατι γένωνται cύν τε δίκαι, τελέθει πρὸc γῆραc αἰὼν ἡμέρα, Th. 1, 123, 1 ἐκ τῶν πόνων τὰc ἀρετὰc κτᾶcθαι, E. fr. 364 ἐκ τῶν πόνων τοι τἀγάθ' αὔξεται βροτοῖc.

1-2 τὰc τύχαc ... θηρᾶν: the metaphorical use of θηράω, θηρεύω in the sense of 'hunting after' a thing is not at all uncommon in Greek poetry from Pindar onwards; cf. e.g. Pi. *N.* 11, 47 κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν, A. *Pr.* 858 f. θηρεύοντεc οὐ θηραcίμουc / γάμουc, S. *Ant.* 92, *OT* 541 f., Arist. *PMG* 842, 1 f.; and in Euripides: *Su.* 115 τί χρῆμα θηρῶν; *Hel.* 1238, *Or.* 568, *Ba.* 839, *IA* 568 μέγα τι θηρεύειν ἀρετάν, 959 f., fr. 187, 3; see further C. J. Classen, *Untersuchungen zu Platons Jagdbildern*, Berlin 1960, 12 f.

The context demands that τὰc τύχαc is interpreted as 'success, which one can acquire by hard work'; this use of τύχαι is rather striking, as τύχαι indicates usually the fortune (good or bad) that *happens* to one, but we may compare some passages where the τύχαι are the object of somewhat comparable verbs: E. *El.* 996 f. τὰc cὰc δὲ τύχαc θεραπεύεcθαι / καιρόc, fr. 1077, 2 f. τὰc γὰρ παρούcαc οὐχὶ cῴζοντεc τύχαc / ὤλοντ'.

2 πατέρα cὸν: Bothe's transposition is probably right, as resolution of the

fourth longum with neighbouring long anceps would be very rare (cf. Snell[2] 20). Resolution of the last part of πατέρα however can be paralleled from *Med.* 375, S. *El.* 1361, *OT* 1496, and in the same position as in the mss. of our fragment: *Med.* 505 πατέρα κατέκτανον, S. *OT* 826 πατέρα κατακτανεῖν, though both with neighbouring short anceps. The corruption could of course be easily explained as a result of the tendency towards *simplex ordo*; cf. for this cause of corruptions W. Headlam, *Transposition of words in MSS*, CR 16, 1902, 243-256; G. Thomson, *Simplex Ordo*, CQ N.S. 15, 1965, 161-175.

If ὦ παῖ is addressed to Archelaos, the father must be Temenos. Why exactly he is said here to be **τιμώμενον** we do not know, but it may well have something to do with his efforts to bring the Heraclids back to the Peloponnese and becoming king of Argos (see comm. on fr. 2, 18 A). Perhaps τιμώμενον was further explained in what followed, but it may also have stood by itself as in e.g. *Su.* 232, *Ba.* 321, fr. 293, 3, 626, 6. For a comparable adhortation to follow the example of one's father cf. *Hel.* 940 ff.

fr. 234 = 8 A

The gnomic nature of this fragment makes all attempts at location purely hypothetical. Several scholars were led by the reference to children to infer that this fragment was about the daughter of Kisseus, who might be reluctant to marry Archelaos (so e.g. Welcker 2, 704, Wagner 674, Th. Kock, RhM 35, 1880, 271 f., Webster 256, Lowicka 268, Mette[5] 87 [F 306]; differently Van Herwerden[2] 332).

πατρὸς ... λόγωι: the 'encircling' hyperbaton is striking and seems to give πατρὸς ... λόγωι extra emphasis; cf. e.g. A. *Ag.* 267 Πριάμου γὰρ ἡιρήκασιν Ἀργεῖοι πόλιν, 1246 Ἀγαμέμνονος ... μόρον, E. *Hipp.* 376 θνητῶν ἐφρόντις' ἧι διέφθαρται βίος, *Andr.* 981 cῶν ... γάμων, *HF* 26 γέρων ... λόγος, 329, 1152 etc. Cf. on this type of hyperbaton in Aeschylus Fraenkel A. *Ag.* 3, 827 f. (appendix F); examples from E.'s lyrics in Breitenbach 249 ff.

πείθεcθαι λόγωι: for the expression (mostly with the plural) cf. e.g. *Med.* 801 f., *Andr.* 192 f., 870, *IT* 93, 574, 714, *IA* 1240. For the thought cf. fr. 110 ἐγὼ δ', ὃ μὲν μέγιcτον, ἄρξομαι λέγειν / ἐκ τοῦδε πρῶτον· πατρὶ πείθεcθαι χρεὼν / παῖδας νομίζειν τ'αὐτὸ τοῦτ' εἶναι δίκην.

fr. 235 = 9 A

Not much can be said about the speaker of this fragment or its position in the play; for attempts cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 708, Van Herwerden[2] 330, Schmid *GGL* I 3, 628 n. 7, Lowicka 269.

For the idea that riches and ἀρετή are hard to combine see Heinimann 36 n. 45 (who gives some further references); Dover 110 ff. (discussion of the

dangers of hybris and softness); on the fact that we usually find it confined to moralizing and philosophical contexts cf. W. den Boer, *Private morality in Greece and Rome*, Leiden 1979, 160f. (and 152 n. 6 on *poverty* as a cause of crime). For attacks on riches in Euripides' later plays cf. Di Benedetto 203ff.; some general remarks also in Schmid *GGL* I 3, 735ff.; Hemelrijk 111ff.

πλουτεῖς·: with πλουτεῖς several different interpretations are possible:

(1) it could be a statement made to somebody who actually was rich (Kisseus?), in which case we could put a comma (so Nauck) or a high stop after πλουτεῖς and regard δέ as adversative δέ without preceding μέν (cf. *Hipp.* 911 [and Barrett ad loc.]; fr. 126; 641, 1 [all quoted below]; KG 2, 272f., Denniston 166f.);

(2) πλουτεῖς could be taken as a paratactical conditional clause, equivalent to εἰ πλουτεῖς 'suppose you are rich'; cf. Stahl 353, 4 "Mit rhetorischem Nachdrucke wird in der späteren Sprache, von Herodot und den Attikern an, der Indikativ auch von einer blossen Annahme gebraucht, indem der Redende sie als wirkliche Tatsache hinstellt". Usually such an indicative is accompanied by καὶ δή or εἶεν (e.g. A. *Eu.* 894; cf. KG 1, 202f., Schwyzer 2, 307 c 1), but sometimes we find it without these particles, e.g. in *Or.* 646f. ἀδικῶ· λαβεῖν χρή μ' ἀντὶ τοῦδε τοῦ κακοῦ / ἄδικόν τι παρὰ σοῦ, Ar. *Ec.* 179, *Av.* 78 (cf. Van Leeuwen ad loc.). Again δέ is best interpreted as adversative, cf. on (1); and we could still punctuate with comma or high stop, or alternatively we could put a question-mark (so Van Herwerden[2] 330, Hense and Austin). Cf. KG 2, 234 Anm., who admit that this punctuation is possible in such cases, but object "... durch die Frage wird die rhetorische Kraft des Satzes gebrochen". Cf. three lines of comparable structure: *Hipp.* 911 σιγᾷς· σιωπῆς δ'οὐδὲν ἔργον ἐν κακοῖς (Barrett prints σιγᾷς; and in his comm. ad loc. remarks that a short silence after σιγᾷς; would answer the question in the affirmative; however, we could equally well print σιγᾷς· and regard it as conclusive: Hippolytus gets no answer to his two questions in 909; he then again urges Theseus to speak in 910; still no answer is given, so he infers in 911 σιγᾷς·), fr. 641, 1 πλουτεῖς, τὰ δ'ἄλλα μὴ δόκει συνιέναι; fr. 126 σιγᾷς· σιωπὴ δ' ἄπορος ἑρμηνεὺς λόγων.

Although the exact interpretation of our line cannot be recovered, for lack of context, the thought is still clear: being rich is not as nice as it seems, but implies being stupid and cowardly.

ἀμαθία δειλόν θ'ἅμα: there is no reason to think of corruption here; for θ'ἅμα thus combining two things cf. e.g. *Andr.* 702 εἰ τόλμα προσγένοιτο βούλησίς θ'ἅμα, 805, *Hec.* 819 etc. The combination of ἀμαθία and δειλόν need to cause no problems, δειλόν apparently being used in the sense of 'a cowardly thing'. The notions of ignorance and cowardice are also combined in Th. 2, 62, 4 αὔχημα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀπὸ ἀμαθίας εὐτυχοῦς καὶ δειλῶι τινι

ἐγγίγνεται, Pl. *Grg.* 477 b 7 ἀδικίαν ... καὶ ἀμαθίαν καὶ δειλίαν ("three cardinal vices" Dodds ad loc.).

Perhaps there is also a moral connotation in ἀμαθία: stupidity implying moral depravity (cf. Wilamowitz and Bond on *HF* 347 and comm. on fr. 257, 2).

The connection of being rich with being stupid and cowardly was proverbial. For stupidity cf. e.g. *Phaeth.* 164 f. τοῖς πλουτοῦσι τοῦτο δ'ἔμφυτον/ σκαιοῖσιν εἶναι, fr. 96 σκαιόν τι χρῆμα πλοῦτος ἥ τ'ἀπειρία, 163, 641; more examples in Diggle on *Phaeth.* 165. For the connection with cowardice cf. *Ph.* 597 δειλὸν δ' ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ φιλόψυχον κακόν (cf. Carcinus *TrGF* 1, 70 F 9), Hippon. fr. 36 West, B. 1, 160 f. (where see Maehler), Ar. *Pl.* 202 f. νὴ τὸν Δί', ἀλλὰ καὶ λέγουσι πάντες, ὡς / δειλότατόν ἐσθ'ὁ πλοῦτος et passim; cf. Newiger 167 ff. For a plausible explanation of the association of riches and cowardice cf. Dover 111 f. on "the softness engendered by luxury, which made for poor endurance on campaign and cowardice in battle".

fr. 236 = 10 A

For attempts to locate this fragment cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 707, Van Herwerden[2] 331, Webster 257, Lowicka 267. For the thought cf. S. F 397 οὔτοι ποθ' †ἥξει† τῶν ἄκρων ἄνευ πόνου, Epicharmus 23 B 36 (1, 203, 18 DK) τῶν πόνων πωλοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάντα τἀγάθ' οἱ θεοί, fr. com. adesp. 532 (3, 505 Kock) ἅπαντα τὰ καλὰ τοῦ πονοῦντος γίνεται, X. *Mem.* 2, 1, 28; E. frs. 134, 364, 426, 432, 461, 701, 1052, 7; cf. Collard on *Su.* 323 b.

σὺν: strictly speaking no choice between σύν and ἐν is possible here, without the context. In itself both prepositions are equally possible (cf. e.g. *Su.* 323 ἐν γὰρ τοῖς πόνοισιν αὔξεται [sc. σὴ πατρίς] and fr. 1051 σὺν τοῖσι δεινοῖς αὔξεται κλέος βροτοῖς) and can be used instrumentally without much distinction, although instrumental ἐν may keep something of the original sense 'in' (cf. e.g. A. *Pr.* 425 f. ἐν πόνοις / δαμέντ' ἀκαμαντοδέτοις). If the context demanded such a connotation of the preposition, ἐν would be preferable.

σὺν μυρίοισι ... πόνοις: cf. e.g. *Or.* 689 πόνοισι μυρίοις, 1662 f. μυρίοις/ πόνοις.

fr. 237 = 11 A

Again the fragment is too gnomic to justify attempts at location. For suggestions cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 703, Van Herwerden[2] 331, Webster 257, Lowicka 267. For the thought cf. comm. on fr. 236 and Collard on *Su.* 447-9. The contrast between an easy life and πόνοι here and in the following

fragments recalls the story about Herakles choosing between Κακία and Ἀρετή in X. *Mem.* 2, 1, 21-34.

νεανίαν ... ἄνδρα: in Homer we find νεανίας always in connection with ἀνήρ (cf. LSJ s.v. I 1 and e.g. *Od.* 10, 278 νεηνίηι ἀνδρὶ ἐοικώς). Later we find it both with and without ἀνήρ, cf. in Euripides e.g. with ἀνήρ *Andr.* 604 νεανίου μετ'ἀνδρὸς, *El.* 344, *IA* 933, fr. 162, 1; without ἀνήρ *Ion* 316 παῖς δ'ὢν ἀφίκου ναὸν ἢ νεανίας; *Alc.* 698, *IT* 1369. Still, considering the practice in poetry and comparing it with the use in prose, where νεανίας is generally (though not always) found without ἀνήρ, it seems that if we have a choice between νεανίαν ... ἄνδρα and νεανίαν ... ὄντα, the first is preferable in a poetic text and the second may be rejected as a trivialization. As to the actual meaning of the word, we may take it as 'a youth', but it is also possible that it is chosen rather to suggest youthful energy; cf. *HF* 1095, where it is used of Herakles, and Bond ad loc.

τολμᾶν ἀεί: here too the text of Stobaeus is preferable to Orion's: Euripides never combines the inf. τολμᾶν with an inf. which is dependent on it, but always uses it in an absolute sense or with an acc. (cf. e.g. *Hec.* 751 τολμᾶν ἀνάγκη, *IA* 303 τολμᾶις δείν', ἅ σ' οὐ τολμᾶν χρεών) although he sometimes has an inf. dependent on other forms of τολμάω (e.g. *Alc.* 552 τολμᾶις ξενοδοκεῖν). The inf. πονεῖν was probably added by somebody who did not understand this absolute use of τολμάω, or wanted to make it more clear what was meant. For ἀεί at the end of a line cf. e.g. *Alc.* 700, *El.* 1102 etc. Orion's text was preferred by Blaydes 113 and defended by Schneidewin 98 (both compared fr. 1052, 1 for ὄντα).

2 ῥάιθυμος: only here in E., but we find ῥαιθυμία twice: *Cyc.* 203 τίς ἡ ῥαιθυμία; *Med.* 217f. οἱ δ'ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς / δύσκλειαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥαιθυμίαν (where see Page). The thought in *Med.* 217f. is very similar to our fragment; for ῥαιθυμία in comparable contexts cf. also Theodektes *TrGF* 1, 72 F 11 πολλὰ δεῖ / μοχθεῖν τὸν ἥξοντ' εἰς ἔπαινον εὐκλεῶς· / ῥαιθυμία δὲ τὴν παραυτίχ' ἡδονὴν / λαβοῦσα λύπας τῶι χρόνωι τίκτειν φιλεῖ, Philiskos *TrGF* 1, 89 F 1 οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ μάταιε, σὺν ῥαιθυμίαι / τὰ τῶν πονούντων μὴ πονήσαντας λαβεῖν. Comparing these passages it is obvious that what we want here is ῥάιθυμος, not Orion's ἄθυμος.

As to the spelling of the word there are two possibilities: (1) ῥάιθυμος from *ῥαΐ-θυμος (comparable to formations like καλλί-ζωνος etc.) or (2) ῥάθυμος, formed with the Attic adv. ῥᾶ as εὔθυμος from εὖ, which is supported by the spelling in Ptolemaic papyri; ῥάιθυμος, which we find in mss. of later date, must then be a secondary formation through analogy with ῥάιδιος etc.; cf. J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen 1953-1979, 2, 1057; Frisk s.v. ῥᾶ.

εὐκλεής: for the connection of πόνοι, and fame cf. fr. 134 εὔκλειαν ἔλαβον οὐκ ἄνευ πολλῶν πόνων, 474 πόνος γάρ, ὡς λέγουσιν, εὐκλείας πατήρ, 1007 d, 1 f. Snell, A. fr. 315.

3 εὐανδρίαν: the reading εὐδοξίαν has been generally accepted here, in spite of the fact that the majority of the mss. of fr. 237 and the mss. of fr. 1052, 7 οἱ γὰρ πόνοι τίκτουςι τὴν εὐανδρίαν agree in reading εὐανδρίαν (Nauck, following Jacobs, wanted to write εὐδοξίαν also in fr. 1052, 7), and admittedly it gives the right sense, which εὐανδρίαν at first sight does not seem to do (cf. e.g. Cobet[1] 295: "οἱ πόνοι aliud quodvis potius parere possunt quam τὴν εὐανδρίαν"). Still, I think there are good reasons to prefer εὐανδρίαν (as did Wilamowitz[4] 4, 188, who called εὐδοξίαν a "schlechte Variante", though without stating why). It is obviously the *lectio difficilior*, because in order to make sense it must be taken to mean 'fame which is the result of εὐανδρία'. I have not, so far, found εὐανδρία used in this sense anywhere else, but similar substantives are often thus used; cf. KG 1, 13: "Die abstrakten Substantive, welche den Begriff von Tugenden oder des Gegenteils ausdrücken, werden oft in prägnanter Weise für das gebraucht was durch diesselben bewirkt wird", and e.g. S. *Aj.* 75 δειλίαν ἀρῆι, *Ant.* 924, E. *Med.* 627 ff. ἔρωτες ὑπὲρ μὲν ἄγαν / ἐλθόντες οὐδ' εὐδοξίαν / οὐδ' ἀρετὰν παρέδωκαν / ἀνδράςιν, 218 (quoted on 2 ῥάιθυμος), *Hel.* 1151 ff. τὰς ἀρετὰς πολέμωι / ... κτᾶςθε (where see Kannicht), Lycurg. *Leocr.* 49 ἃ γὰρ ἆθλα τοῦ πολέμου τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράςιν ἐςτίν, ἐλευθερία καὶ ἀρετή ('reputation for valour', Petrie ad loc.). Especially with ἀρετή this use was very common, cf. Harpocratio 1, 57 Dindorf ἀρετή· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐδοξία Ἀνδοκίδης καὶ Θουκυδίδης ἐν α' (i.e. Th. 1, 33, 2) and Plu. *De audiendis poetis* 6, 24 c-d on ἀρετή used as εὐδοξία. Obviously we must relate this phenomenon to the Greek 'shame-culture', in which one could not have ἀρετή etc. if one did not possess it in the eyes of others, i.e. if one did not have a reputation of ἀρετή — an idea which was still current in V B.C.; cf. Adkins 154 ff.; Dodds 17 f.; 26 n. 109 (on καλόν and αἰςχρόν).

Considering this use of ἀρετή there can, I think, be little doubt that εὐανδρία too can be used in this way; εὐδοξίαν then may well be an intrusive gloss (it is apparent from Harpocratio and Plu. [mentioned above], that εὐδοξίαν is the very word that would be used as a gloss for εὐανδρίαν here; on glosses in Stobaeus cf. Luria 82), or else it could be intended as a correction (for examples of a similar tendency towards 'correction' of substantives thus used in a pregnant sense among fairly modern scholars cf. the 'emendations' of ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν recorded by Jebb on S. *Ph.* 1420, and of κάλλος ἐκτήςω recorded by Kannicht on *Hel.* 1097).

It may be added that with εὐανδρίαν there may be a deliberate rhetorical effect after ἄνδρα and ἀνήρ in the preceding lines. For the thought and the pregnant use of εὐανδρίαν it is worth comparing *Heracl.* 623 ff. (on the death of Makaria) οὐδ' ἀκλεής νιν / δόξα πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ὑποδέξεται· / ἁ δ' ἀρετὰ βαίνει διὰ μόχθων.

τίκτουςι: the metaphorical use of τίκτειν occurs quite often in Euripides,

when it is said that one thing leads to or implies another; cf. e.g. fr. 79 τὰ μείζω τῶν μέσων τίκτει νόσους, 340, 1 ff. Κύπρις ... / ... τίκτει πόλεμον, 437, 438, 575, 3, 745, 1071; cf. also A. fr. 315 τῶι πονοῦντι δ'ἐκ θεῶν / ὀφείλεται τέκνωμα τοῦ πόνου κλέος. Cf. H. Blümner, *Studien zur Geschichte der Metapher im Griechischen*, Leipzig 1898 (ʳAmsterdam 1974), 74.

fr. 238 = 12 A

Wilamowitz[4] 1, 203 believed that this fragment was not from Euripides' *Archelaos*, because he thought it unlikely that Euripides would say the same thing twice (cf. fr. 237) in one play, and once clumsily at that. The many conjectures that have been made he considered a waste of effort; cf. also Wilamowitz[4] 4, 188 f.: "Dass βιοῦν und εἰσκτᾶσθαι unmöglich ist, sehen viele: aber dann sind sie mit ihren Konjekturen bei der Hand, gleich als ob nicht beides den geforderten Sinn gäbe, nur nicht in der Sprache des Euripides. Und wenn die Verse gar hintereinandergestellt werden, trauen sie doch dem Dichter das Selbstplagiat zu. Das ist also eine Variation innerhalb Kap. 29 des Stobaeus"; Austin ad loc., and on interpolations and falsifications in Stobaeus Luria 102; differently Hense ad loc.: "v. βιοῦν et εἰσκτᾶσθαι expendens vereor ne non immunis sit locus gnomologorum licentia".

If we consider Wilamowitz's reasons for the rejection of this fragment more closely, (1) the argument that Euripides repeats himself does not seems fatal, as the idea of gaining fame by efforts was apparently rather prominent in the *Archelaos* (cf. frs. 236, 237, 239, 240); (2) the inf. βιοῦν proves to be quite common in later Greek literature (cf. e.g. Philo *De Virt.* 15, *Quod Det.* 78; Lucian *Herm.* 84 etc.), but the only example of it in older Greek literature which is mentioned in *ThGL* s.v. is our fragment (in tragedy one would expect the inf. βιῶναι, cf. S. *OT* 1488; E. fr. 1052, 9 διαβιῶναι); this may well rouse the suspicion that this inf. was not written by Euripides; (3) εἰσεκτήσατ' appears to be a hapax (cf. LSJ and *ThGL* s.v.), which in itself need be no objection if it were clear what εἰσ- meant, but εἰσ- seems inexplicable. On βιοῦν and εἰσεκτήσατ' cf. also Gomperz 1, 179. I think these reasons are sufficient to make us doubt the authenticity of the fragment, and Wilamowitz was probably right to reject it.

If one does not reject the fr. and looks at the conjectures proposed, Vitelli's ἡδονὰς ζητῶν βίου is not unattractive, cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 383 ἡδοναὶ πολλαὶ βίου (more examples in Barrett ad loc.), *Med.* 194, *Hel.* 755. For the thought cf. e.g. fr. 1043 οὐδεὶς ἔπαινον ἡδοναῖς ἐκτήσατο; contrast with πόνοι also Antisthenes fr. 113 Decleva Caizzi ἡδονὰς τὰς μετὰ τοὺς πόνους διωκτέον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τὰς πρὸ τῶν πόνων. Nauck's εἶτ' ἐκτήσατ' however (which is printed in Hense's text of Stobaeus) is impossible, as εἶτα would have to come

before εὔκλειαν, not before ἐκτήσατ' (cf. e.g. fr. 417, 3 f. μὴ δ' ὡς κακὸς ναύκληρος εὖ πράξας ποτὲ / ζητῶν τὰ πλείον', εἶτα πάντ' ἀπώλεσεν).

For attempts to locate the fragment cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 703 Van Herwerden[2] 331, Webster 257, Lowicka 267.

fr. 239 = 13 A

This fragment, preceded by another line, is attributed to the *Erectheus* in Stob. III 29, 22 and Orion. As it is very unlikely that two continuous lines from the *Erectheus* were repeated in the *Archelaos* (cf. app. 1 B 1), something must be wrong with the attributions. Hense on Stob. III 8, 13 suggests: "aut intercidit Archelai ecloga (...) aut iam in fonte Orionis Stobaeique communi duo Archelai versus cum Erechthei illo ... male fuerant coniuncti". The second solution was preferred by Nauck on fr. 364, who puts its lines 2-3 between square brackets and in his apparatus mentions three sources where fr. 364, 1 appears on its own. I think both explanations offered by Hense are quite plausible, but we cannot really exclude the possibility that the attribution to the *Archelaos* in Stob. III 8, 13 is wrong and that the lines really belong to the *Erectheus*. A. Martínez-Díez, *Eurípides Erecteo*, Granada 1976, keeps them in his text (p. 154); cf. also his comm. on p. 237; there is no discussion of the matter in P. Carrara, *Euripide Eretteo* (Papyrologica Florentina 3), Firenze 1977.

For attempts to locate the fragment in the *Archelaos* cf. Welcker 2, 703, Webster 257, Lowicka 267.

1 ὁ δ' ἡδὺς αἰών: for this use of the article cf. e.g. *Or.* 807 f. ὁ μέγας ὄλβος ἅ τ' ἀρετὰ / μέγα φρονοῦς' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα and KG 1, 582 and 598. For ἡδὺς αἰών cf. also fr. inc. 1052, 3 f. ὁρᾶις τὸν εὐτράπεζον ὡς ἡδὺς βίος / ὅ τ' ὄλβος ἔξωθέν τίς ἐστι πραγμάτων (if that is the right text; cf. Nauck), *Cyc.* 451 ff. λέγων / ὡς οὐ Κύκλωψι πῶμα χρὴ δοῦναι τόδε, / μόνον δ' ἔχοντα βίοτον ἡδέως ἄγειν and the definition in Schmidt *Syn.* 2, 557 "... alles, was unsern Körper mit angenehmem Gefüle erfüllt oder auf einen einzelnen Sinn einen angenehmen Eindruck macht ... Am wenigsten hat das Wort auf den Gesichtssinn Bezihung, am meisten auf den des Geschmackes."

ἡ κακὴ τ'ἀνανδρία: article as in ὁ δ' ἡδὺς αἰών. The way of life that is suggested in this line, and its opposite, are well illustrated by the description of the way of living of Hippomedon in *Su.* 881-7 Ἱππομέδων τοιόσδ' ἔφυ· / παῖς ὢν ἐτόλμης' εὐθὺς οὐ πρὸς ἡδονὰς / Μουσῶν τραπέσθαι πρὸς τὸ μαλθακὸν βίου (cf. ἡδὺς αἰών), / ἀγροὺς δὲ ναίων σκληρὰ τῆι φύσει διδοὺς / ἔχαιρε πρὸς τἀνδρεῖον (cf. ἀνανδρία), ἔς τ' ἄγρας ἰὼν / ἵπποις τε χαίρων τόξα τ' ἐντείνων χεροῖν, / πόλει παρασχεῖν σῶμα χρήσιμον θέλων (cf. line 2 of our fr.), where see Collard; for the thought cf. also fr. 187. The combina-

tion with ἡδὺς αἰών and comparison with *Su.* 885 suggest that ἀνανδρία must be taken in the sense of 'a way of living which is unsuitable for a man' (although the anthologist apparently wanted it to be taken as 'cowardice', putting it in his chapter ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕΙΛΙΑΣ). The variant ἀτολμία seems to fit the context less well. Luria 101 regards the variants as the result of the adaptation of the fragment to the chapters in which it had to appear (i.e. ἀνανδρία / οὔτ' οἶκον οὔτε πόλιν ἀνορθώσειεν ἄν in the chapter ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕΙΛΙΑΣ [Stob. III 8], and ἀτολμία / οὔτ' οἶκον οὔτε βίοτον οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ in the chapter ΠΕΡΙ ΦΙΛΟΠΟΝΙΑΣ [Stob. III 29]) and gives a few more examples of this practice (comparing *Med.* 292 f. with Stob. III 36, 3 and *Hec.* 375 with Stob. III 30, 3, 1).

2 πόλιν ἀνορθώσειεν ἄν: Valckenaer's correction has been more or less generally accepted and is probably right; ἀνορθόω is well attested in tragedy and is found with πόλιν twice in Sophocles: S. *OT* 46 ἀνόρθωσον πόλιν, 51; in Euripides cf. *Erectheus* fr. 65, 95 A σοὶ δ', ἣ πολέως τῆσδ' ἐξανώρθωσας βάθρα, and Collard on *Su.* 1227-31, who notices that "ὀρθοῦν and compounds, ὀρθός and ὀρθῶς are very frequent in descriptions of safe and prosperous government". After πόλιν and before ὀρθώσειεν ἄν ἀν- could easily fall out. Of course, if one accepts the idea of an original ΑΝΟΡΘΩΣΕΙΕΝ one could also interpret the letters with Blaydes as ἂν ὀρθώσειεν, which would also give an acceptable text. Meineke's ἀπορθώσειεν ἄν is based on Phrynichus p. 21, 3 (de Borries) ἀπορθοῦν πόλιν ἢ οἰκίαν· σημαίνει μὲν τὸ διοικεῖν ὀρθῶς, μετενήνεκται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπορθούντων τὰς ναῦς τοῖς οἴαξιν. "Es ist einleuchtend dass der Grammatiker die Euripideische Stelle vor Augen hatte" says Meineke (cf. also Mette[5] 85), but I think it is obvious that he had not: even if ἀπορθώσειεν was written in our fragment, Phrynichus' explanation cannot be based on it, as it only fits the pres. ἀπορθόω; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 198: "The distinction in aspect between pres. and aor. systems comes out very clearly in ὀρθόω: where ὀρθῶσαι is 'put upright' ὀρθοῦν can be 'hold upright'". This distinction can also be observed in S. *Ant.* 162 f. τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος ἀσφαλῶς θεοί, / ... ὤρθωσαν πάλιν and 167 ἡνίκ' Οἰδίπους ὤρθου πόλιν (cf. Jebb on 162 ff.). Therefore Meineke's ἀπορθώσειεν has nothing to support it, whereas Valckenaer's ἀνορθώσειεν is simple and well paralleled. For the combination οἶκον ... πόλιν cf. A. *Th.* 190 οἴκωι καὶ πόλει ... κακόν, E. *El.* 130 f. τίνα πόλιν, τίνα δ' οἶκον, ὦ / τλᾶμον σύγγον', ἀλατεύεις; 611, *Ph.* 533, fr. 187, 4.

The variant γαῖαν (which was defended by Wagner 674) is rejected by Hense on Stob. III 8, 13 as a correction *metri causa* for πόλιν, which had become unmetrical after ἀν- had fallen out (for the combination cf. *Med.* 32 γαῖαν οἴκους θ' but γαῖαν ὀρθόω does not seem to be a conception which was current in the Vth century). οὔτε βίοτον (βίωτον) οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ(ν) was

already rejected by Hense as an "anthologi interpolatio", or perhaps one should rather say *variatio*; cf. comm. on 1.

fr. 240 = 14 A

Again one can only guess at the context of the fragment. Welcker 2, 703 f. believed that the lines were spoken by Archelaos offering to do his best for Kisseus and his city (for similar views cf. Van Herwerden[2] 331, Webster 257, Lowicka 267), but the indignant rhetorical questions suggest a more agonistic context: somebody (possibly Archelaos) strongly claims the right to exert himself. From frs. 249 and 251 one gets the impression that at some stage in the play somebody, probably Archelaos (cf. comm. ad loc.), is regarded as dangerous because of his good qualities: it is conceivable that fr. 240 too is from a context where Archelaos' qualities and aspirations are the subject of a critical discussion.

1 ἐμὲ: probably said with a certain emphasis; cf. KG 1, 557.

ἆρ' οὐ: it seems best to understand ἄρα here as meaning 'then'. Denniston 39 f. gives examples of ἄρα "in questions following an interrogative" and adding liveliness. For ἄρα in questions *not* following an interrogative we may compare *TrGF* 2, F 81 (ΟΙΝΕΥϹ πρὸϲ 'Αλθαίαν?) καὶ cὸc μὲν οἰκτρὸc παῖδαc ἀπολέcαc πατήρ· / Οἰνεὺc δ'ἄρ' οὐχί, κλεινὸν ἀπολέcαc γόνον; which, with Οἰνεὺc emphatically put first, is very similar to our ἐμὲ δ'ἄρ' οὐ ...; S. *OT* 1444 οὕτωc ἄρ'ἀνδρὸc ἀθλίου πεύcεcθ' ὕπερ; *OC* 1431.

2 ἄμοχθοc: this word is not attested elsewhere in E. (but *Ba.* 194 and fr. 978, 4 have ἀμοχθί), but twice in S. (*Tr.* 147, F 410). For the meaning 'shrinking from toil' (LSJ s.v. 2) cf. Pi. *N.* 10, 30 οὐδ' ἀμόχθωι καρδίαι προcφέρων τόλμαν παραιτεῖται χάριν. Although Grotius' correction is obviously right it may be noted that ἀμόχθητοc is a surprising corruption, as this kind of "apparent derivatives from denominative verbs" (Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 649), which are really mere amplifications of the 'normal' adjectives, is very popular in tragedy, and in Greek poetry in general. Cf. Wilamowitz on *HF* 290, Pearson on S. fr. 249 and 1014, Kaibel on S. *El.* 184 and Kannicht on *Hel.* 449. One wonders whether the corruption was due to somebody who wanted to 'improve' the poetic diction of the line?

3 τῶν μεγίcτων: for τὰ μέγιcτα cf. fr. 426 τά τοι μέγιcτα πάντ' ἀπείργαcται βροτοῖc / τόλμ' ὥcτε νικᾶν· οὔτε γὰρ τυραννίδεc / χωρὶc πόνου γένοιντ'ἂν οὔτ' οἶκοc μέγαc.

ὠρέξατο: apparently used in a metaphorical sense: 'reach after, grasp at, yearn for' (LSJ s.v. II 2 b), cf. *HF* 16, *Ion* 842, *Or.* 328 (more examples in LSJ). A difficulty is that in the context of this fragment one would expect ὠρέξατο to mean the actual acquiring of τὰ μέγιcτα, not just the reaching

after them, but I cannot see how ὠρέξατο could bear this meaning. Badham's idea of separating the line from the two preceding lines is therefore well worth considering. On lines getting wrongly connected see comm. on fr. 232.

fr. 241 = 15 A

As to the interpretation of this fragment, two possibilities deserve consideration: (1) Van Herwerden[2] 334f. attributed this fragment to Kisseus wanting to celebrate Archelaos' victory (cf. test. 7, 5 *qui hostes uno proelio fugauit*), when he returns from the battle-field, and was therein followed by Webster 257, Lowicka 270. Welcker 2, 703 also thought along these lines, but regarded the line as a promise of Kisseus if Archelaos would help him. Van Herwerden's idea is certainly attractive: for the habit of giving such victors a wreath cf. *El.* 870ff. (where Orestes and Pylades return after having killed Aigisthos), esp. 872 (El.:) cτέψω τ'ἀδελφοῦ κρᾶτα τοῦ νικηφόρου and 880-89, where Elektra is actually addressing the men and offering them their wreaths. Cf. also *Tr.* 936f., *El.* 854, *IT* 12 and the way in which cτέφανοc is sometimes used almost in the sense of 'victory' (e.g. S. *Ph.* 841, E. *El.* 614). For wreaths as a means to honour victors in wars and battles see also M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (RGVV 38), Berlin/New York 1982, 153ff.; (2) quite differently Schmid *GGL* I 3, 628: "Kisseus entschliesst sich, im Vertrauen auf Archelaos' edle Abkunft, ihm die Feldherrnwürde zu übertragen". This implies that Archelaos got his wreath *before* he left for the battle, and one is reminded of the motif of giving a wreath to warriors at their departure, which is sometimes found in vase-paintings; cf. Blech o.c. 23 and 174 (references on p. 443f. and 447). For our fragment this may be an economical solution if I am right in supposing that after the battle Kisseus is waiting inside the palace for Archelaos to return to him (see comm. on test. 7, 7-9 *quo ... decideret*): in that case there would be no room for a scene in which Kisseus rushes out to honour Archelaos with a wreath.

Other occasions on which people get a wreath in Euripides are feasts (cf. e.g. *Alc.* 344), meals (*Alc.* 1015), service of Dionysus (*Ba.* 703), visits to oracles (*Hipp.* 806), marriage (*IA* 436). None of these possibilities, however, seems as easy to incorporate into the story of the *Archelaos* as the two mentioned above. Perhaps one should add here, that *if* the daughter of Kisseus' played a part in the *Archelaos*, she too would be among the candidates for the wreath-giving.

τὸν cὸν κρᾶτ': here κρᾶτ' obviously is masc.; elsewhere in Euripides it is mostly impossible to decide what the gender of the word is; only *Ba.* 1139 and 1214 are indisputably neuter and *Hec.* 652 and *El.* 140 are certainly fem. (both of the head of a woman); I have found no other instances in Euripides where the word is indisputably masc. For a survey of the various forms and

genders of τὸ κάρα / ὁ (ἡ) κρᾶς and their use in poetry cf. KB 1, 459f.; cf. also Schwyzer 1, 583.

ἀναστέψαι: apart from here we find ἀναστέφω in Euripides in *Hipp.* 806f. αἰαῖ, τί δῆτα τοῖσδ' ἀνέστεμμαι κάρα / πλεκτοῖσι φύλλοις, δυστυχὴς θεωρὸς ὤν; *Erectheus* fr. 360, 47ff. (= 50, 47ff. A) τρίαιναν ... οὐδὲ Θρῇξ ἀναστέψει (Musgrave: ἀναστρέψει *codd.*) λεὼς / στεφάνοισι (on στέφω etc. see further Blech o.c. 30ff.).

fr. 242 = 16 A

The fragment is too gnomic for location, but εὐγενὴς / ἀνὴρ may allude to Archelaos (cf. comm. on fr. 231, 2 πατέρων ... ἐσθλῶν). For attempts at location cf. Welcker 2, 703, Van Herwerden[2] 327, Lowicka 268f.

1 φέρει: seems to be the right reading; cf. *Su.* 596f. ἀρετὴ δ'οὐδὲν φέρει / βροτοῖσιν, (φέρει $L^{\gamma\rho}$: λέγει *L*), *Hel.* 1064 οὐδὲν ἡ σκῆψις φέρει (and Kannicht ad loc.). Although ἔχει can be used in a very similar sense, it appears to have usually an abstract subst. as its object, cf. e.g. *Andr.* 244 τά γ' αἰσχρὰ ... αἰσχύνην ἔχει, *Or.* 1182 τὸ μέλλειν ἀγάθ' ἔχει τιν' ἡδονήν, *Hel.* 93 (for more examples see Kannicht ad loc.). Because of this similarity of the expressions the variants are easily explained.

τοῦτ': further explained in εὐγενὴς—φάτιν; cf. comm. on fr. 232, 3.

μικρόν: for "the facts about μικρός and σμικρός in Euripides" cf. J. Diggle, Gnomon 47, 1975, 290; Diggle 50.

2 εὐκλεᾶ ... φάτιν: for such *composita abundantia*, which were much favoured by Euripides, cf. Breitenbach 188ff., who distinguishes four types of these compounds: (1) those in which the subst. which they are qualifying is repeated (e.g. *Ph.* 1549 πόδα ... τυφλόπουν), (2) those which contain a synonym of this subst. (this type is found very often, esp. compounds with εὐ- abound in Euripides, whereas they are comparatively rare in A. and S.; cf. e.g. *IA* 1523 ἐπ' εὐτυχεῖ πότμωι), (3) those which contain a variation on the subst. (e.g. *Hec.* 66f. βραδύπουν / ἤλυσιν), (4) those whose second part has no relation to the subst. (e.g. *Ba.* 542 ἀγριωπὸν τέρας). Here we have an example of the second category; cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 773f. τὰν δ' εὔδοξον ... φήμαν, *HF* 288 δόκησις εὐκλεὴς δορός (which could also be interpreted as hypallage; cf. Wilamowitz ad loc.). More examples in Jebb on S. *OC* 716, Page on *Med.* 199-200, Barrett on *Hipp.* 200. For contrast cf. A. *Ag.* 611 ἐπίψογον φάτιν, where the adj., though of the same type, is not abundant (cf. Fraenkel ad loc.).

fr. 243 = 17 A

This fragment may refer to a small, but brave army with which Archelaos defeated the enemy. If so, μυρίου στρατεύματος could indicate the army of

the enemy (so Welcker 2, 704), but this is not necessarily so: it may also be mentioned just for the sake of contrast (see comm.). There is no way of deciding where and by whom the fragment was spoken, cf. Van Herwerden[2] 333 f. (attempts at location: Welcker l.c., Lowicka 267).

1 ὀλίγον ἄλκιμον δόρυ: cf. *Ph.* 1097 f. δορὸϲ / ἀλκῇ δι' ὀλίγου and for ἄλκιμον δόρυ *Heracl.* 815 ἐλθεῖν ... ἐγγὺϲ ἀλκίμου δορόϲ, *Hel.* 1152 λόγχαιϲί τ'ἀλκαίου δορὸϲ; the expression recalls the Homeric ἄλκιμα δοῦρε (e.g. *Il.* 11, 43 etc.) and ἄλκιμον ἔγχοϲ (e.g. *Il.* 3, 338 etc.), cf. *LFrGrE* s.v. ἄλκιμοϲ B 2 d. Yet, in our fragment the adj. seems to be not purely ornamental, but rather conditional; cf. also Bergson 102. For the use of δόρυ in a collective sense for a group of armed soldiers cf. the similar use of words like ἀϲπίϲ, πέλτη, αἰχμή, λόγχη etc., which is quite common in descriptions of military matters; cf. Schwyzer 2, 42; Wackernagel 2, 24 f. and E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, Lund 1942, 1, 13 f. for this use in Latin. Other examples in tragedy are e.g. A. *Eu.* 773 ϲυμμάχωι δορί, *Th.* 216; S. *OC* 1525; E. *Heracl.* 275 f., *Ph.* 78, 441 f., 1097 f.

2 κρεῖϲϲον ... μυρίου ϲτρατεύματοϲ: such statements with κρεῖϲϲον/κρείϲϲων occur rather often in Euripides; cf. e.g. *Med.* 965 χρυϲὸϲ δὲ κρείϲϲων μυρίων λόγων βροτοῖϲ, *Andr.* 764 f. πολλῶν νέων γὰρ κἂν γέρων εὔψυχοϲ ᾖι / κρείϲϲων, *Or.* 805 f., *IA* 1394, fr. 244. They are usually firm statements of a gnomic nature.

μυρίου: μυρίοϲ, which is usually plural, can be singular when connected with collective nouns; cf. e.g. *Hec.* 606 ἔν τοι μυρίωι ϲτρατεύματι, *Ph.* 441 f. μυρίαν ἄγων / λόγχην. Cf. Schwyzer 1, 593.

ϲτρατηγῶι: if we keep the gen. of the mss. we would have to interpret '... better than the leader of a big army', which obviously makes no sense here. Grotius' correction gives the right sense (cf. also Gomperz 1, 114 f.) and is very simple: ϲτρατηγοῦ before μυρίου may well be a case of assimilation; cf. on this type of mistakes H. Fränkel, *Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Argonautika des Apollonios*, Göttingen 1964, 38 ff. A further qualification of μυρίου ϲτρατεύματοϲ is not wanted, as the contrast with ὀλίγον ἄλκιμον δόρυ is already clear enough, but with ϲτρατηγῶι the statement is put into a certain perspective: a small, brave army is better for the leader; cf. Gomperz l.c.; differently Wagner 674; F. W. Schmidt 2, 454.

fr. 244 = 18 A

The contents of this fragment suggest that it could be from the same context as fr. 243, but of course nothing can be proved; cf. Welcker 2, 704; Van Herwerden[2] 333 f.; Lowicka 267.

ὀλίγοι: Nauck suggested παῦροι, perhaps because ὀλίγοι is comparatively rare in tragedy (cf. A. C. Moorhouse, CQ 41, 1947, 38 ff.; LSJ s.v. II 1), but I

think that the change is unnecessary and that ὀλίγοι is more suitable here; cf. *Hipp.* 986 f. ἐγὼ δ'ἄκομψος εἰς ὄχλον δοῦναι λόγον, / ἐς ἥλικας δὲ κὠλίγους σοφώτερος and *Erectheus* fr. 356 (= 46 A) ὀλίγους ἐπαινῶ μᾶλλον ἢ πολλοὺς κακούς. It is striking that in these instances too ὀλίγοι indicates a small, select group, which is 'better' than the great majority of people; cf. also Heracl. fr. 104 D-K (= 101 Marc.). Goossens 668 f. suggested that therefore the fragment could be "une profession de foi oligarchique". This, I think, goes much too far, but if one compares the use of ὀλίγοι with the use of παῦροι (*Heracl.* 327, *Hel.* 539: both times simply indicating 'a few') and the way in which it is contrasted with ὄχλος and πολλοὶ (κακοί) one cannot help wondering whether the use of ὀλίγοι in the above instances was inspired by the political contrast between οἱ ὀλίγοι and οἱ πολλοί as it is often found in Thucydides (e.g. Th. 6, 38, 4; 8, 9, 3; 8, 97, 2).

ἐσθλοί ... κακῶν: as the fragment appears in the chapter ΕΠΑΙΝΟΣ ΤΟΛΜΗΣ in Stobaeus, these words must probably be taken in the sense 'brave' and 'cowardly' (cf. LSJ s.v. ἐσθλός I 1 and κακός I 3). The same contrast we find in fr. 728, 1 ff. φιλεῖ τοι πόλεμος οὐ πάντων τυχεῖν, / ἐσθλῶν δὲ χαίρει πτώμασιν νεανιῶν, / κακοὺς δὲ μισεῖ (cf. A. fr. 100, S. F 724). The contrast ἐσθλοί/κακοί is used in a moral sense in *Ion* 1621 f., and in a social sense in *Hipp.* 411 f. (cf. Barrett ad loc.) and *Hel.* 1213 (which is however quoted by Stob. IV 42, 9 as if it were meant in a moral sense, and indeed it may secretly have had this sense too; cf. Kannicht ad loc.). Of course we cannot altogether exclude the possibility that the words were not used in a military sense in the *Archelaos*: the fragment may have been quoted in this chapter of Stobaeus only because without context it would fit in.

POxy. 3, 419 + fr. 245 = 19 A

We have no certain indications as to the position of this fragment in the play. Yet there are a few things which offer some indications: (1) the metre: the trochaic tetrameters suggest that the fragment is from a scene which was fairly important and/or emotional; the fact that they are followed by lyrics suggests end of a scene (for details see below, and comm. on 12 τὸ λοιπόν), (2) the text: (a) in 6 there is a short invocation of Apollo, (b) in 7 an older person addresses a younger person (here young Archelaos of course springs to mind), (c) from the advice given in 8-9 it is clear that the older person who must still be speaking is well-disposed towards the younger one, (d) 13-16 are about 'man and τύχαι' (for details see comm.; other, more hypothetical indications too are dealt with in the commentary), (3) test. 7: possible candidates for a dialogue containing ὦ παῖ would be: (a) Kisseus-Archelaos, (b) old slave-Archelaos (test. 7, 10 *hoc* [sc. Kisseus' tricks] *regis seruus Archelao patefecit*), but even if we could be sure that these two pairs were the

only possibilities, it would be difficult to make a choice: Kisseus may have talked to Archelaos in a friendly manner before the battle, or even after, though it is not so easy to see why this should be in trochaics; alternatively the revelations of the old slave may well have resulted in an emotional scene in which trochaic tetrameters were used (cf. for a similar scene of revelation *IA* 855-916). There is nothing in the text which would be against the idea that our fragment contains the last lines of such a scene, but then we do not have much text and other possibilities cannot really be excluded. Cautious also Lowicka 270.

Webster 257 considered the fragment as a dialogue between Apollo as a *deus ex machina* and Archelaos (who addresses Apollo in 7); for a trochaic *deus ex machina*-scene he compared the last scene of the *Ion*. One could argue against this that (1) the remains of the lines suggest rather a still critical situation (cf. the doubtful εἰ δ'εὐτυχήϲουϲ'[in 11) than a situation where all is nicely settled by a god, (2) the advice in 8-9 seems a little odd from a *deus ex machina*, whom one would expect to concentrate on the foundation of Aigai (cf. test. 7, 12ff. *inde profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce, oppidumque ex nomine caprae Aegeas constituit*), but not to dwell upon the possibilities of death and slavery, (3) no *deus ex machina* (not even Artemis in the *Hipp.*) ever addresses a person on the stage with the familiar ὦ παῖ, (4) τὸ λοιπόν, which in itself would be well in its place in a *deus ex machina*-scene, is by no means restricted to such scenes (see comm. on 12). For earlier interpretations of 8-9 cf. e.g. Welcker 2, 704, Wagner 675, Van Herwerden[2] 334.

Metre

1-12: 8-9 are trochaic tetrameters and the remains of 1-12 fit this metre without any difficulties (in itself it would of course be conceivable that the fragment contained partly the remains of iambic trimeters and then at a certain point became trochaic; 1-3 are so scanty that they could be fitted into both metres; 4 however fits in easily in a trochaic tetrameter, whereas attempts to fit it into a iambic trimeter lead to grave difficulties: as the papyrus apparently had a straight left edge, 4 is not far enough to the left, nor far enough to the right to fit into a iambic trimeter: as to its quantities it would fit into the space from second to third anceps, but there it would yield a *caesura media* without elision. As soon as one takes the line to be trochaic, all these difficulties disappear).

13: it is not certain whether this is still trochaic or already lyrical, but probably it is lyrical (see comm.).

14: this must be lyrical because of ἁμέραν and the length of the line.

15-16: apparently 'go with' 14 and must therefore be lyrics too (the quantities offer no help here); see comm.

Euripides employed trochaic tetrameters (as far as we know) from *HF* onwards. In *HF* 855-73 (where see Bond) and *Tr.* 444-61 we find troch. tetr. in a rhesis (in *HF* preceded by three lines of stichomythia). From *IT* (1203-33) and *Hel.* (1621-41) onwards troch. tetr. are used for an excited dialogue, often with antilabe and stichomythia in it. Trochaic rheseis are then generally shorter (only to introduce or conclude a trochaic scene; cf. e.g. *Ph.* 588 ff., 625 ff.), though in *IA* there are also longer speeches in troch. tetr. (e.g. 334-375; 378-401); cf. Krieg 44 f.

Trochaic scenes generally show a certain "dramatische Bewegtheit" or "feierliche Gehobenheit" (Imhof 141; cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1621) and are therefore often found in an important position in the play or epeisodion of which they form part (e.g. end of scene followed by a lyrical section in *HF* 855-73, *IT* 1203-33, *Ph.* 588-637, *Or.* 729-806, 1506-36; beginning of scene *Ion* 1250-60, *Ph.* 1335-9; end of play *Ion* 1606-22, cf. the ends of A. *Ag.* 1649-73, and S. *OT* 1515-30). They are not, as a rule, found very early in the play, but often appear in the last epeisodion or in the exodos. Cf. on trochaic tetrameters in E. in general Krieg 42-51; Imhof 125-143; T. Drew-Bear, *The trochaic tetrameter in Greek tragedy*, AJPh 89, 1968, 385-405; for a short survey see Mannsperger in Jens 164-167.

1 μεν[: the text of the *editio princeps* suggests μέν, but one can also think of some form of μένοϲ or μένω.

2]ρονημα[: if this is all one word some form of φρόνημα seems to be the only word that could be supplied in Euripides, cf. Buck-Petersen 229; but Von Arnim's [τ is of course mere conjecture. As the word could be used in good, bad or neutral sense (cf. LSJ s.v.), it would not make us much wiser about the context (though perhaps it is worth noticing that φρόνημα 'pride' can be one of the characteristics of the rich, cf. e.g. *Andr.* 164, *Su.* 862 f., *El.* 371; Hemelrijk 114: a reference to the rich Kisseus is therefore among the possibilities). It is also possible that we must divide the letters differently, so e.g.]ρον ημα[, etc.

3]κτείνοντ': if] κτείνοντ', this may have something to do with Kisseus' murderous attempts or with Archelaos' revenge. But this is very hypothetical and ἐ]κτείνοντ' is also possible. If so, we can derive very little from it about the context, as the word can be used of very different things in Euripides; e.g. of a dead body (e.g. *Hipp.* 789), hands (e.g. *Alc.* 768), life (*Su.* 1109), weapons (e.g. *Andr.* 1131), an army (*Heracl.* 801), hair (*Ba.* 831), supplications (*Or.* 290) etc.; cf. also the intr. use in *Su.* 654 (where see Collard). Yet another possibility is ἐ]κτίνοντ', wrongly spelled ἐ]κτείνοντ'.

4]αρωϲ: ἀνι]αρῶϲ (cf. S. *Ant.* 316) does not seem very likely for metrical reasons: in the known instances of the word in E. ι is short (though long in Homer and Sophocles; cf. LSJ s.v.); cf. e.g. *Med.* 1095. As in troch. tetr. the

caesura follows the second anceps, ἀνι]αρῶς ἔμελλε π[would have to be so placed in the line that the caesura followed ἔμελλε. This would imply resolution of the second longum, which is not very common in tragedy (never in A. and S.; cf. Koster[1] 141). Page's γ]ὰρ ὡς certainly is a possibility.

5]ηθεις: perhaps going with the subject of ἔμελλε in 4?

παρωτε[: except that -τε must be the last syllable of a word nothing can be said which is not pure conjecture. We might consider a form of πάρειμι, but then we do not know how uncertain the dotted letters were. There may have stood something quite different.

6 Φοῖ]β': this seems to be the only fitting supplement; cf. Dornseiff-Hansen s.v. -βος. Blass' Πόλυ]β' can, I think, safely be discarded, as no Polybos seems to have played a part in this story. In fact it looks like a rather desperate solution, because Blass considered κάθιζε as more fitting for a mortal than for a god (but see comm. below). For the expression Φοῖ]β' ἄναξ cf. e.g. *Andr.* 1003 ἄνακτα Φοῖβον, *Ph.* 631 καὶ cύ, Φοῖβ' ἄναξ Ἀγυιεῦ, καὶ μέλαθρα χαίρετε (in the same metrical position as here); on invocations consisting of name + ἄναξ cf. Langholf 53.

The invocation of Apollo may have something to do with test. 7, 13 *ex responso Apollinis*, but it is also quite possible that someone is invoking Apollo here in a short, quick prayer; cf. e.g. *Andr.* 900 ὦ Φοῖβ' ἀκέcτορ, πημάτων δοίηc λύcιν, *El.* 221 ὦ Φοῖβ' Ἄπολλον· προcπίτνω cε μὴ θανεῖν, *Or.* 1242 f.; cf. on such short prayers Langholf 47 (more examples).

κάθιζε π[: if this is rightly read, it is best interpreted as an imperative; after the voc. καθῖζε is far less likely. On an imperat. pres. in prayers see comm. on *Kresph.* fr. 453, 9. It is, however, difficult to see what κάθιζε must mean: if it is transitive, we may perhaps compare *Ion* 1540 f. εὐεργετῶν cε Λοξίαc ἐc εὐγενῆ / δόμον καθίζει and *Epigr.* 802, 7 Peek Ἑρμεί⟨α⟩, cὺ δὲ τόν γε μετ' εὐcε[β]έεccι καθίζοιc; if it is intransitive, it is very hard to see what the imperat. must mean. Still, it should be noted that the last two letters of the line were dotted by Grenfell-Hunt, so the imperative is not beyond doubt and it may be worth comparing those passages where Apollo is said to be 'sitting on' the omphalos or tripod; cf. *Ion* 5 f. ὀμφαλὸν / μέcον καθίζων Φοῖβοc, 366 εἴπερ καθίζει (sc. Apollo) τρίποδα κοινὸν Ἑλλάδοc, *El.* 980, *Or.* 956. It is sad that we no longer have the possibility to verify from the papyrus whether καθίζειc[or καθίζων[would be compatible.

7]τ', ὦ παῖ: this has always been printed as]τω, παῖ, but this implies word-end of a poly-syllabic word after long first anceps, as the metrical position of the line must be – ⏑ –] × – ⏑ –, and would mean violating Porson's Law (on which in this position cf. Maas 34 f. and 71; L. P. E. Parker, CQ N.S. 16, 1966, 1 ff.). We are therefore compelled to read]τ', ὦ παῖ.

παῖ: see comm. on fr. 233: Archelaos is probably the only candidate for this address.

προβαλλ[: as the syllable after -βαλλ[is the second anceps, it can be either long or short and must be the last syllable of the word (unless its fourth syllable was elided). There may have stood e.g. an inf. (so Von Arnim) or imperative (Grenfell-Hunt, Blass). Von Arnim's supplement of the line, which of course cannot be right in detail (see comm. on 7]τ', ὦ παῖ), still suggests an interpretation which makes sense of what follows: if δέ in 8 is adversative, a train of thought like 'you must not take unnecessary risks, but...' is certainly a possibility. For προβάλλω in the sense 'risk' or even 'throw away, expose' (oneself, one's life, one's body)' cf. e.g. Hdt. 7, 141, 1 προβάλλουcι δὲ cφέαc αὐτοὺc ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ τοῦ κεχρηcμένου, S. *OT* 744f. ἐμαυτὸν εἰc ἀρὰc / δεινὰc προβάλλων, E. fr. 82, 6f. A ἐγ[ὼ] γὰρ εἰ μὲν ἀνδρὶ προύβαλον δέμαc / τοὐμόν, *Rh.* 182f. χρὴ δ' ἐπ' ἀξίοιc πονεῖν / ψυχὴν προβάλλοντ'ἐν κύβοιcι δαίμονοc. A different interpretation suggests itself if we compare *Hec.* 825 Κύπριν προβάλλειν, where the verb must mean something like 'put forward as an argument or plea' (LSJ s.v. A II 3) and *Rh.* 370f. τὰν ζάχρυcον προβαλοῦ / ... πέλταν 'hold before oneself so as to protect' (LSJ s.v. B II 1). The general idea then could be 'you may of course defend yourself, but ...'.

8 δέ: indicates that the speaker is the same as in 7.

coι: must then be the παῖc who was addressed in 7.

ἓν ... μόνον: 'just one thing'. This use of εἷc reinforced by οἷοc or μοῦνοc we find as early as Homer, e.g. *Il.* 4, 397 ἕνα δ' οἶον ἵει οἶκονδε νέεcθαι, *Od.* 7, 65 μίαν οἴην παῖδα λιπόντα, 23, 227 ἀμφίπολοc μία μούνη. In Euripides it occurs several times, e.g. *IT* 573 †ἓν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον†, 1052 ἑνὸc μόνου δεῖ, τάcδε cυγκρύψαι τάδε, *Su.* 594, *Hel.* 815. For some prose examples cf. Stein on Hdt. 1, 38, 2; in Latin cf. e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 130 *unus est solus inuentus qui* ... The idiom is also familiar from modern languages.

ἕν: Euripides often starts a sentence in this way with ἕν (standing by itself or with a subst. as a pronoun), which is then further explained either in a sentence that follows asyndetically (like in our fragment) or is introduced by explicative γάρ, or by a word or clause standing in apposition; cf. e.g. *Med.* 381f. ἀλλ' ἕν τί μοι πρόcαντεc· εἰ ληφθήcομαι / δόμουc ὑπερβαίνουcα etc., *Hipp.* 715f. (?), *Su.* 409, *Hel.* 773; for more examples see Barrett on *Hipp.* 715-6.

προφωνῶ: here the papyrus confirms προφωνῶ against the metrically impossible προφανῶ. As far as I can see προφωνῶ is attested only in tragedy and once in *AP* 5, 21, 1 (Rufinus). It is found several times of an urgent command, cf. e.g. S. *Aj.* 1089 καί coι προφωνῶ τόνδε μὴ θάπτειν, E. *Hipp.* 955f. τοὺc δὲ τοιούτουc ἐγὼ / φεύγειν προφωνῶ πᾶcι.

ἐπὶ δουλείαν ... ἔλθηιc: cf. for this expression *Tr.* 1329f. ἴτ' ἐπὶ / δούλειον ἁμέραν βίου, *Ba.* 971 δεινὸc cὺ δεινὸc κἀπὶ δείν'ἔρχηι πάθη.

9 ἐλευθέρωι: Nauck's correction must be right as it gives the expected contrast with 'πὶ δουλείαν ... ζῶν ἔλθηιc: the addressed must rather die as a

free man than become a slave. ἐλευθέρωϲ would have a different meaning, cf. e.g. *Heracl.* 558 f. (Makaria:) μὴ τρέϲηιϲ μιάϲματοϲ / τοὐμοῦ μεταϲχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρωϲ θάνω, sc. 'from my own free will', *Or.* 1169 ff. ὃν οὐ καταιϲχυνῶ / δοῦλον παραϲχὼν θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρωϲ / ψυχὴν ἀφήϲω, where it seems to denote 'dying in a way which befits a free man'.

For the idea expressed in 8-9 cf. B. 3, 30 f. οὐκ ἔμελλε / μίμνειν ἔτι δ[ουλοϲύ]ναν (sc. Kroisos, who after the capture of Sardis wants to burn himself and his family) (and Maehler ad loc.); Ion *TGrF* 1, 19 F 53 οὐδ' ὅ γε ϲῶμα τυπεὶϲ διφυεῖϲ τε κόραϲ / ἐπιλάθεται ἀλκᾶϲ / ἀλλ' ὀλιγοδρανέων φθογγάζεται· / θάνατον δ' ὅ γε δουλοϲύναϲ προβέβουλε; Pl. *Grg.* 483 b 1 ἀνδραπόδου τινόϲ, ὧι κρεῖττόν ἐϲτιν τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν (cf. Dodds on 512 b 2); D.S. 9, 26, 3. Cf. also *Andr.* 113 f. ὤμοι ἐγὼ μελέα, τί μ' ἐχρῆν ἔτι φέγγοϲ ὁρᾶϲθαι / Ἑρμιόναϲ δούλαν; *Tr.* 637 τοῦ ζῆν δὲ λυπρῶϲ κρεῖϲϲόν ἐϲτι κατθανεῖν (and more often in *Hec.* and *Tr.* where the Trojan women prefer death to a life as slaves; cf. H. Kuch, *Kriegsgefangenschaft und Sklaverei bei Euripides*, Berlin 1974, 54). For the idea that one must not want to live long at all costs cf. also S. *Aj.* 473-80, *Ant.* 463 f., *El.* 1320 f., F 952; E. *Or.* 1150 ff., fr. 596.

10]των: this could be (1) gen. plur. of the article] τῶν (Von Arnim), (2) gen. plur. of an adj. or subst. or part., (3) nom. sing. masc. of a part.

ἔϲωθε: ἔϲωθε instead of ἔϲωθεν is rare (cf. LSJ s.v.) and is attested in E. only in *Heracl.* 42 ἔϲωθε ναοῦ (apparently *metri causa*); cf. perhaps also A. *Ch.* 800 (text not absolutely certain). This seems to explain why the scribe first wrote the normal ἔϲωθεν, of which the ν subsequently had to be deleted. Euripides' use of ἔϲωθε here can be best explained if it was for metrical reasons, i.e. if the metrical position of the line was – ⏑] – × – ⏑ – [. If -ε was not brevis, but anceps (i.e. – ⏑ – ×] – ⏑ – × – [), there is no reason why Euripides should not have stuck to the normal practice of writing ἔϲωθεν. A drawback of a metrical position – ⏑] – × – ⏑ – [is perhaps that it would imply that the two syllables (– ⏑) which would then be lost at the beginning of the line had to occupy the same amount of space as the three (in 9) or four (in 8) syllables which are lost in the preceding lines. Still, this seems less hard to explain than use of ἔϲωθε for other than metrical reasons (we may e.g. think of wide letters; resolution of the first syllable; accumulation of consonants; a piece of papyrus left blank for some reason; some sort of correction etc.).

ἔϲωθε probably indicates the inside of the palace, as opposed to 'outside', i.e. the stage where the speaker is standing. For this use of words like ἔϲω, ἔνδον, ἔντοϲ cf. Hourmouziades 13. Several constructions are possible: ἔϲωθε is (1) prep. + gen., cf. e.g. A. *Ch.* 800 ἔϲωθε (ἔϲω Hermann) δωμάτων, E. *IT* 41 ἔϲωθεν τῶνδ' ἀνακτόρων.]των could then be the ending of a subst. depending on it (e.g. δωμά]των), or of an adj.; for words that can indicate the

background-building cf. Hourmouziades 13; (2) adv., in which case]των could be part of a part., (3) adj.; if so,]των could be] τῶν and something may have been said about 'those within the palace'; cf. S. *El.* 1322f. cιγᾶν ἐπῄνεc'· ὡc ἐπ' ἐξόδωι κλύω / τῶν ἔνδοθεν χωροῦντοc, *Tr.* 601, E. *Hipp.* 567 ἐπίcχετ', αὐδὴν τῶν ἔcωθεν ἐκμάθω, Ar. *Pl.* 964 ἐγὼ τῶν ἔνδοθεν καλέcω τινά.

κᾱ̣[: if the metrical position of the line is such as has been argued above, κᾱ̣[must be part of a word of two syllables (the second being anceps and followed by the caesura). The long-mark may indicate crasis as in e.g. *POxy.* 6, 855, col. II 22 (Men.?, III A.D.) κᾱν, *PLond.* 733, 17, 33 (B., II A.D.) κᾱμε; more examples in Laum 385f. Here too κᾱ̣[μέ would be a possibility; one could also think of κᾱ̣[ιτα.

11]ν· εἰ δ' εὐτυχήcουc'[: the high stop after]ν indicates that with εἰ δ' a new sentence started. The acute accent on εὐτυχήcουc[(in which ω probably was a simple orthographical error) suggests that we must read εὐτυχήcουc'[and not εὐτυχὴc ουc[; the normal way of indicating the adj. would have been to put a gravis on the penultimate syllable (cf. Laum 402ff.). However, sometimes oxytone words are indicated by an acute accent on the last syllable, even when they do not occur before a stop or an enclitic; cf. Laum 162ff., who lists our line amongst his examples. Although these examples are not many, they still show that εὐτυχήcουc'[cannot be regarded as absolutely certain. For the interpretation, however, εὐτυχήcουc'[seems to offer better prospects than εὐτυχὴc ουc[(οὕc?, οὗc?, οὓc'?) which would be difficult to construct, whereas εἰ δ' εὐτυχήcουc' 'but if they are successful...' seems quite neat. On the meaning of εὐτυχέω (etc.) cf. De Heer 75ff.; McDonald 294ff.; 300f.

12]ε̣cτω: Von Arnim's] ἔcτω is a possibility; an attractive supplement, considering the context, would also be Radt's εὐ]εcτώ.

τὸ λοιπόν: this expression is often found towards the end of a play, referring to the future beyond it. So e.g. *Cyc.* 709, *Alc.* 1148, *Su.* 1231; and with reference to an aition and/or as part of the words of a *deus ex machina Andr.* 1258 (Thetis), *HF* 1330, *IT* 1457 (Athena), *Hel.* 1674 (Dioskouroi), *Rh.* 968 (Mousa). (On the possibility of a *deus ex machina*-scene in the *Archelaos* see comm. on test. 7, 13). Still, it is by no means used exclusively towards the end of a play, but occurs in various positions; sometimes we find it, like here, in a context with εὐτυχήc, -έω near the end of a scene, cf. *Hel.* 1450 τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτυχῆ με θήcετε, *Ph.* 1018; cf. also *Ph.* 1197f. εἰ δ' εὐτυχὴc / ἔcται τὸ λοιπὸν ἥδε γῆ, θεοῖc μέλει (end of messenger's speech), *IT* 841. 10-12 look like a conclusive remark with reference to the future and we may perhaps infer from 11 εἰ δ' that two possibilities were mentioned here, both with their implications for the future. If so, the fragment may well be from a scene where the future was still a matter of uncertainty, and this interpretation

would therefore be in accordance with the idea that the fragment might be from the scene where the old slave tells Archelaos about Kisseus' murderous plans.

13 Here probably the lyrics begin. We cannot be absolutely certain, however, as word-division as well as readings are uncertain in the last part of the line, i.e. in διατων[, which — if rightly read — allows διὰ τῶν [and δι' ἀτῶν [. In the first case the line cannot be trochaic, in the second it can, but then the expression is not a very likely one. The line has generally been regarded as lyrical (except by Austin 17, who takes it to be still trochaic), and considering its context I think that must be right: (1) 10-12 look like a conclusion, so that we may expect something new starting in 13; of course it could be that 13 is still part of that conclusion, but (2) in 14 — which is indisputably lyrical — there is a high point after ἁμέραν: as it is likely that the lyrics were written in indentation (see below), we would have very little room indeed for a sentence ending with ἁμέραν if it began in 14, whereas 13 could very well be from the beginning of a lyrical section and offers prospects of constructing]ν ἁμέραν· (see comm. on 14).

ἄ]νδρα: this supplement may well be regarded as certain. It seems unlikely that this was the first word of the line, as this would imply that in 14-16 too only one letter is missing at the beginning of the line, which seems hard to maintain: if]ν is read correctly in 14, no word of two letters ending with it seems to make sense; in 15 ἀεὶ is excluded by the accent in the papyrus and a verb by the nom. plur. αἱ τύχα[ι; of 16 nothing can be said in this respect. The objections against only one letter being lost in 15 are, I think, fatal.

So something must have preceded ἄ]νδρα, though it is hard to guess what and how long: we may assume in a text of II-III A.D. that the lyrics were written in indentation, but then the depth is a matter of conjecture (on the varying depths see comm. on *Kresph.* fr. 66, 68 A). Blass' οὔποτ' might just go (cf. *Andr.* 464), but it would not leave much indentation, nor does it exhaust the possibilities. It should be noted that it is likely that the lost word(s) still left ἄ]νδρα as the subject of an acc. cum inf. dependent on χρή, because the sentence ended with ἁμέραν in 14, so that there is not much room for elaborate constructions.

διατων[: if rightly read, διὰ τῶν[is a possibility. Snell's δι' αἰῶν' [deserves some attention: the expression is not attested elsewhere in tragedy, but δι' αἰῶνος is fairly frequent, cf. e.g. A. *Ag.* 553 f. τίς δὲ πλὴν θεῶν / ἅπαντ' ἀπήμων τὸν δι' αἰῶνος χρόνον; *Ch.* 26, *Eu.* 563, *Pers.* 1008 (?), *Suppl.* 582; S. *El.* 1024; E. *Alc.* 475, *Hipp.* 1426. In a context with ἁμέραν and αἱ τύχα[ι δι' αἰῶν[ος would certainly be conceivable. But we have no way of verifying it from the papyrus, so it is perhaps better to stick to Grenfell-Hunt's τ.

14 Undoubtedly lyrical because of ἁμέραν.

]ν: if this is rightly read as ν, there are a few possibilities worth consi-

dering: (1) it could be the last letter of an article, adj., part. or pronoun going with ἁμέραν: ἡμέρα is very often thus qualified in E., and as it is here followed by a high point, such a qualification would have to *precede* it. Qualification + ἁμέραν could then be a colon in much the same way as e.g. *Su.* 784 τὰν ἄελπτον ἁμέραν, *Tr.* 1330 δούλειον ἁμέραν βίου. Cf. also comm. on 15; (2) it could be the last letter of an inf. dependent on χρὴ in 13. None of the things, however, which people are 'doing' with a day in E. seemed at first sight suitable here (ἄγειν *Hec.* 364; ἀπολιπεῖν *Ion* 720; ἐξανύειν *Med.* 649; ἰδεῖν *Cyc.* 437, *Su.* 731, fr. 816, 7; μένειν *Ph.* 1638; περᾶν *Andr.* 102; φυγεῖν *Hipp.* 889; φέρειν *Rh.* 991 f.), but of course there may be other possibilities.

15 Although the quantities are undecisive, there can be little doubt that 15-16 are lyrical too, because they seem to motivate what was said in 13-14 (γὰρ).

]ει̃: with this accent εἰ and ἀεί are excluded; the nom. plur. αἱ τύχα[ι excludes a verb-form in -εῖ (unless we could have something like ὃϲ εὐτυχ]εῖ as object of the activities of the τύχαι, but for such a thing there may not be enough room). A dat. of a subst. or adj. in -εῖ, however, seems quite possible. Blass' ἐν βραχ]εῖ has been the only suggestion in this direction and deserves some consideration. Although in E. the expression ἐν βραχεῖ is always used in a context about telling or hearing or explaining something 'in a few words' (cf. e.g. *Hel.* 1522 ὡϲ ἂν βραχεῖ μάθηιϲ, *Or.* 734 ἐν βραχεῖ ... δηλώϲω etc., and Collard on *Su.* 566), we would have a parallel from what seems to be a very similar context in S. F 646 οὐ χρή ποτ' εὖ πράϲϲοντοϲ ὀλβίϲαι τύχαϲ / ἀνδρόϲ, πρὶν αὐτῶι παντελῶϲ ἤδη βίοϲ / διεκπερανθῆι καὶ τελευτήϲηι δρόμον. / ἐν γὰρ βραχεῖ καθεῖλε κὠλίγωι χρόνωι / πάμπλουτον ὄλβον δαίμονοϲ κακοῦ δόϲιϲ, / ὅταν μεταϲτῆι καὶ θεοῖϲ δοκῆι τάδε (that is, if one takes ἐν βραχεῖ as a prepositional phrase; for details see Radt ad loc.); cf. also Pi. *P.* 1, 81 f.; S. F 771, 3.

γὰρ: this may explain why a man should or should not do what the chorus says in 13-14 that he should or should not do.

αἱ τύχα[ι: it is attractive here to think of the τύχαι as the unpredictable powers which may suddenly change one's life altogether, cf. e.g. *Med.* 198 δειναί τε τύχαι ϲφάλλουϲι δόμουϲ, *HF* 1396 καὶ τοὺϲ ϲθένονταϲ γὰρ καθαιροῦϲιν τύχαι, *Tr.* 1203 ff. θνητῶν δὲ μῶροϲ ὅϲτιϲ εὖ πράϲϲειν δοκῶν / βέβαια χαίρει· τοῖϲ τρόποιϲ γὰρ αἱ τύχαι, / ἔμπληκτοϲ ὡϲ ἄνθρωποϲ, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοϲε / πηδῶϲι, †κοὐδεὶϲ αὐτὸϲ εὐτυχεῖ ποτε†; cf. also S. *Ant.* 1158 ff. If so, the contents of this choral fragment may be comparable to those of *Tr.* 1203 ff. The line of thought may have been: 'a man should (not be too confident about his good fortune), because the τύχαι (may suddenly upset it)'; ἁμέραν suggests something like 'looking not beyond the present day' or perhaps 'one day destroying everything' (cf. e.g. Pi. *I.* 4, 16 ff., A. *Pers.* 431 f., S. *El.* 1149 f.,

E. *HF* 509f., fr.420, *TrGF* 2 F *638, 13f. + Kannicht-Snell ad loc.; Kamerbeek on S. *Aj.* 131, 132; but an acc. μία]ν ἁμέραν seems to be difficult then, as one would rather expect it to be temporal as in *Med.* 340, 355, *Heracl.* 851, *Or.* 656).

16]ι: perhaps part of a verb of which αἱ τύχα[ι are the subject?

τ̣ό̣ν̣: if the accent was rightly read, τ̣ό̣ν̣ cannot be the article: the article would have been indicated by a gravis (cf. Laum 151f.), whereas the acute accent shows that the word must have contained another syllable (e.g. τόνδε could be distinguished from τὸν δέ in this way; cf. *POxy.* 5, 841 fr. 82, 29 [Pi. *Pae.*, II A.D.] τόνδ'; Laum 400f.) or was followed by an enclitic (cf. Laum 293f.). So either τ̣ό̣ν̣ or θ̣ρεκ̣ must have been wrongly read; or alternatively the scribe must have written the wrong accent.

θ̣ρεκ̣[: if rightly read and preceded by τὸν perhaps part of a subst. or adj. in the accusative. LSJ have θρεκτικός 'able to run', θρεκτός = τροχαῖος (S. F 463, but θρεκτοῖϲι probably must be κρεκτοῖϲι; see Radt ad loc.), θρεκτός = δρόμος (Phot.). If the quick action of the τύχαι is dealt with, a reference to running may be possible, or, alternatively, we may compare S. F 646, 3 τελευτήϲηι δρόμον in a similar context. But we have no means of knowing how certain or uncertain the readings are here.

fr. 246 = 20 A

This fragment has been attributed to the scene where friends of Kisseus advise him to get rid of Archelaos (test. 7, 6 *ille ab amicis dissuasus*), who has just beaten the enemy, but has not yet returned. Cf. Welcker 2, 704, Van Herwerden[2] 335f., Webster 256, Lowicka 268f.

Surely the first line looks very much like a description of young Archelaos (see comm.), but we cannot know for certain the exact connotation of ἐνθύμηϲιϲ in 2. It may be 'anxiety, worry' (as the interpretation of Welcker etc. would demand: 'young, poor and clever' would in that case suggest somebody who is inclined to use his youthful energy and clever tricks in order to enrich himself at the cost of others), but it is also conceivable that it means simply 'consideration, reflection' and that the line is just focusing someone's attention on Archelaos, who, being 'young, poor and clever' could be considered as eager and capable to help. Cf. Dover 102ff., who shows that the notion of youth can suggest either bold action in a good sense or (more often) wild and reckless behaviour (for young men's eagerness to fight cf. e.g. *Su.* 232ff., S. *OC* 1229ff.). With πένηϲ there is a similar ambiguity: it may indicate (1) that Archelaos wants to enrich himself and is therefore willing to help when offered a proper reward, (2) that Archelaos is prone to commit crimes in order to enrich himself (for πενία as a cause of crime cf. e.g. *El.* 375f.; Hemelrijk 77ff. and intr. to fr. 235), (3) that Archelaos, because of his

poverty, is clever and energetic (cf. e.g. fr. 54, 3 f. πενία δὲ δύcτηνον μέν, ἀλλ' ὅμωc τρέφει / μοχθεῖν τ'ἀμείνω τέκνα καὶ δραcτήρια, 715, 2; Hemelrijk 90 ff.).

If we keep Welcker's interpretation, there would be an odd contradiction between fr. 246 and 249 (which he attributes to the same scene).

1 νεανίαc: like fr. 233, 1 ὦ παῖ, fr. 19, 7 A ὦ παῖ, fr. 237, 1 νεανίαν ... ἄνδρα and perh. fr. 254, 1 ὦ τέκνον this is likely to refer to young Archelaos.

πένηc: also in fr. 232, 3 and fr. 249 poverty is referred to in a context which suggests that the poor man in question was Archelaos. For the poverty of an exile cf. intr. to fr. 232.

coφόc: 'clever, skilful'; to which qualities of Archelaos this refers in particular we cannot tell.

2 εἰc ἓν ἐλθόντ': a common way of expressing that certain things are put or coming together, cf. *Tr.* 1154 f. τἀπ' ἐμοῦ τε κἀπὸ coῦ / ἐc ἓν ξυνελθόντ', *IT* 1015 f. ἅπαντα γὰρ / cυνθεὶc τάδ' εἰc ἕν, *Heracl.* 403, *HF* 489, *Ion* 1016, fr. 580, 2; also of people: *Andr.* 1172, *Hel.* 742, *Ph.* 462, *Or.* 1640, *IA* 1127 (sometimes with gen. part.: *Andr.* 1172, *Hel.* 742).

ἐνθυμήcεωc: in tragedy this word is only attested here (it was apparently a prose-word, cf. LSJ and *ThGL* s.v.) and it is difficult — without context — to guess its exact meaning here. LSJ s.v. I interpret it in our fragment as 'consideration, esteem', but 'esteem' does not very well suit πένηc in 1, nor do they mention any other instances of this meaning.

More plausible interpretations would be: (1) 'consideration, reflection' (LSJ s.v. II 1) in a neutral sense (cf. e.g. Th. 1, 132, 5 δείcαc κατὰ ἐνθύμηcιν τινα ὅτι οὐδείc πω ... ἀφίκετο and the use of ἐνθυμεῖcθαι in a neutral sense [LSJ s.v. I 1]); (2) 'anxiety, worry' (LSJ s.v. III), as the traditional interpretation of the fragment would demand (cf. Hp. *Praec.* 4 [9, 256 Littré] ἄχρηcτον γὰρ ἡγεύμεθα ἐνθύμηcιν ὀχλεομένωι τὴν τοιαύτην and the use of ἐνθύμιοc, which very often has this connotation of anxiety and worry, cf. e.g. *Od.* 13, 421 μὴ δή τοι κεῖνόc γε λίην ἐνθύμιοc ἔcτω, S. *OT* 739 τί δ'ἐcτί coι τοῦτ', Οἰδίπουc, ἐνθύμιον; *Tr.* 109, E. *HF* 722 ἐπειδὴ coὶ τόδ' ἔcτ' ἐνθύμιον; for a discussion and more examples cf. Wilamowitz on *HF* 722; Kamerbeek on S. *OT* 739).

Without context I can see no way of choosing here between (1) and (2).

fr. 247 = 21 A

The gnomic nature of the fragment again makes attempts at location very hazardous. Welcker 2, 705 suggested the same speaker as for fr. 246; Lowicka 269 also thought it was from the same scene, but from a third person defending Archelaos (if so, the part. construction ὄλβιοc γεγὼc would have to be conditional, as Archelaos was poor). It must be admitted that the fragment

could form a very suitable repartee to the statement in fr. 249 (which is generally regarded as belonging to the persuasion-scene), but the connection does not seem altogether cogent. The idea behind this question may be either some doubt about the behaviour of Archelaos 'once he is rich' (cf. fr. 249) or, more in general, doubt about the moral qualities of the rich (for which see comm. on fr. 235), in which case the subject is not necessarily Archelaos. But other interpretations may also be possible: without context nothing definite can be said.

ὄλβιος: 'rich'; for the meaning of ὄλβιος etc. in Euripides see comm. on fr. 230, 3 ὄλβος.

fr. 248 = 22 A

This fragment too is too gnomic for attempts at location to be more than mere guesses. For some attempts cf. Welcker 2, 705, Van Herwerden² 336, Webster 256, Lowicka 268. It is understandable why Musgrave wanted to separate 2-3 from 1, because, if we keep them together, the fragment seems to tell us that there is no shrine of Poverty, because of the speaker's dislike of the mental attitude of certain people — which seems odd. For a possible explanation see comm.

1 οὐκ ἔστι Πενίας ἱερὸν: without context it is not easy to know what is really meant with this remark. Surely it seems to have been literally true: although we do find personification of Penia (cf. e.g. Hdt. 8, 111, 3; Ar. *Pl.* passim and the well-known passage Pl. *Smp.* 203 b ff.; for a survey cf. Newiger 162 f.), she always remains an allegorical figure and evidence of a cult is very uncertain, as often with such abstractions; cf. Voigt in *RE* 19, 1938, 495 ff. (s.v. Penia); Newiger 162 f.; in general also G. Hertel, *Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut*, Nürnberg 1969. Alternatively Πενίας ἱερὸν may have been used in a metaphorical sense. For such a use of ἱερόν can quote two parallels from Euripides: (1) *Hel.* 1002 f. ἔνεστι δ' ἱερὸν τῆς δίκης ἐμοὶ μέγα / ἐν τῆι φύσει, implying that the speaker has a great respect for justice; in a similar way one could express one's lack of respect for something by denying the presence of a shrine for it in one's heart; cf. [D.] 25, 35 καὶ δίκης γε καὶ εὐνομίας καὶ αἰδοῦς εἰσι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις βωμοί, οἱ μὲν κάλλιστοι καὶ ἁγιώτατοι ἐν αὐτῆι τῆι ψυχῆι ἑκάστου καὶ τῆι φύσει, οἱ δὲ καὶ κοινῆι τοῖς πᾶσι τιμᾶν ἱδρυμένοι· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀναισχυντίας οὐδὲ συκοφαντίας οὐδ' ἐπιορκίας οὐδ' ἀχαριστίας, ἃ πάντα τούτωι πρόσεστιν. On the metaphor cf. also Kannicht on *Hel.* 1002 f.; and cf. A. *Th.* 409 f. μάλ' εὐγενῆ τε καὶ τὸν Αἰσχύνης θρόνον / τιμῶντα, *Ag.* 383 f., *Eu.* 538 ff.; (2) fr. 170 οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος, / καὶ βωμὸς αὐτῆς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει. A cult of Peitho is well and early attested (cf. Voigt in *RE* 19, 1938, 194 ff. s.v. Peitho; Hamdorf 63 f.), but it is obvious that ἱερόν and βωμός must here be

taken in a metaphorical sense. A somewhat comparable use of βωμός, and more elaborately phrased, can be found in fr. 153 A ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῖν τῶν ἐν οὐρανῶι θεῶν / βωμοὺς ἱδρύσας ... / ἑνὸς κατημέλησεν ὡς οἶμαι τότε, / ὅς τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ θεῶν ὑπερτάτου / Πλούτου ϲτεφήρη βωμὸν οὐχ ἱδρύσατο. / ἔμοιγε †Ζευ.[: apparently this whole statement is thus phrased with the purpose to indicate the speaker's fondness of riches (cf. 4 ὡς οἶμαι, 7 ἔμοιγε).

As to the relation of 1 with 2-3 we now have the following possibilities: (1) 1 'there is no shrine of Poverty' (literally, or metaphorically: 'in people's hearts') — lacuna containing one or more lines leading up to 2 μισῶ γὰρ (e.g. 'and I think this is rightly so...') — 2-3; (2) 1 'there is no shrine of Poverty', either preceded by a reference to the speaker's heart, in which case 2-3 could follow immediately, or followed by a lacuna containing something to that effect; (3) there is no connection between 1 and 2-3 (so Musgrave).

On the whole it does not seem very likely that 2-3 followed 1 *directly*, but it is conceivable that they are from the same speech, parts of which may have been left out by the anthologist.

αἰσχίστης θεοῦ: in V B.C. we find an increasing tendency to call all kinds of powerful abstractions θεός. Cf. Nilsson[1] 1, 775; 813; Wilamowitz on *HF* 557; Kannicht and Dale on *Hel.* 559-60. Examples in Euripides are *Ph.* 506 τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὥστ' ἔχειν Τυραννίδα, 531 f. τῆς κακίστης δαιμόνων ... / Φιλοτιμίας, 782 τῆι δ' Εὐλαβείαι, χρησιμωτάτηι θεῶν, 798 (Ἔρις), *HF* 557 (Αἰδώς), fr. 153, 5 f. A (quoted above); for more examples see Schmid *GGL* I 3, 713 f.

As to the actual form θεοῦ we are perhaps justified in expressing some doubt: it is usual in Greek to add a partitive gen. to the superlative (cf. KG 1, 20 f.), and we find very often in Euripides that someone is the greatest or most beautiful of the gods (cf. the examples quoted above, and further e.g. *Alc.* 790, *Hipp.* 1301, 1394, *Hel.* 1105, *Or.* 1682 f.; frs. 453, 2; 1109, 9 and fr. 153, 5 f. A). For αἰσχίστης θεοῦ one could only compare fr. 269, 4 οὐκ οἶδε τὸν μέγιστον ἀνθρώποις θεόν and 430, 3 Ἔρωτα πάντων δυσμαχώτατον θεόν, of which the latter is not really a parallel because of the gen. πάντων, whereas fr. 269, 4 seems different because of the addition of ἀνθρώποις. On the other hand we may compare for αἰσχίστης θεοῦ such appositions as *Or.* 10 ἀκόλαστον ἔσχε γλῶσσαν, αἰσχίστην νόσον, 499, fr. 230, 3. But we should at least reckon with the possibility that Euripides might have written αἰσχίστης θεῶν rather than θεοῦ.

αἰσχίστης: for derogatory remarks on πενία cf. e.g. Hes. *Op.* 717 οὐλομένην πενίην θυμοφθόρον (+ West ad loc.), Alc. fr. 364 L-P, S. F 1137, Ar. *Pl.* 442 f. and E. fr. 230, 2 f.; 1059, 3. See further Stob. IV 32b (ΠΕΝΙΑΣ ΨΟΓΟΣ) passim; Hemelrijk 66 ff.

2 μισῶ: a phrase which is often used by Euripides when people are expressing a strong moral judgment. Cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 413 f. μισῶ δὲ καὶ τὰς

cώφρονας μὲν ἐν λόγοις, λάθραι δὲ τόλμας οὐ καλὰς κεκτημένας, fr. 61 μισῶ σοφὸν ἐν λόγοισιν, ἐς δ' ὄνησιν οὐ σοφόν, 360, 30f.; 492, 2ff.; 528; 886 (= Ar. *Ra.* 1427f., considered by Rau 123 n. 18 to be parody rather than quotation); 905; for the construction here cf. especially *Su.* 1109 μισῶ δ' ὅσοι χρῄζουσιν ἐκτείνειν βίον, where like in our fragment the object of μισῶ is provided by the relative clause.

ὄντως: this word, which is believed to have been coined by the Sophists (cf. Wilamowitz and Bond on *HF* 610, Starkie on Ar. *Ve.* 997) is attested in tragedy only once in Sophocles (S. F 681 ὄντως Gesner) and perhaps once in Aeschylus (*POxy.* 18, 2162 fr. 2 [a] I 4; but the division of the letters is uncertain) and then several times in the later plays of Euripides: apart from our fragment it is found in *HF* 610, 1345 (*L*: ancient quotations have ὀρθῶς, accepted by Diggle), *Ion* 223, *IA* 1622, always indicating that a thing has really and truly happened. To indicate the authenticity of an affect, as in our fragment, we find it also used in Ar. *Nu.* 86 εἴπερ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας μ' ὄντως φιλεῖς.

φρονοῦσι: absolute 'have understanding, be wise, prudent', as often in tragedy; cf. LSJ s.v. I 1.

3 φρονοῦσι δ' †οὐδενός τε† χρημάτων ὕπερ: it has long been recognized that the line as it stands in the mss. must be corrupt: there is no way in which οὐδενός τε can be constructed here. When judging the attempts at emendation one has to bear in mind that they must fit in with an attack on *poverty*, not on riches (cf. 1, which suggests that the speaker is condemning poverty, and the chapter-heading of Stob. IV 32 b ΠΕΝΙΑΣ ΨΟΓΟΣ; this observation was made by Munro 236). That is, those conjectures which are based on the idea that the object of the speaker's dislike are 'those who have sense, but use it only in order to get money' must be rejected. To this group belong the conjectures of Grotius (who translates "illos ... qui sapiunt quidem, / sed sola sapiunt ad lucra, ulterius nihil"), Wakefield (I gather that his φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδὲν ὥς γε χρημάτων ὕπερ must mean something like 'they think of nothing so much as about money', but in that case I would expect either οὐδενὸς ὥς γε χρημάτων ὕπερ [both genitives depending on ὕπερ] or οὐδὲν ὥς γε χρήματα [cf. LSJ s.v. φρονέω III]), Hermann, anonymus apud Gaisford, Pflugk, Schmidt ("ich hasse alle diejenigen, welche sich lediglich um des Reichtums willen abquälen"), Tucker.

Conjectures which fit in with an attack on poverty are: (1) Welcker's φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδενός γ' ἀχρημάτων ὕπερ, which he explains as follows: "Nach meiner Conjectur ἀχρημάτων spricht der Rathgeber fort, er verachtet die Armuth und hasst die, welche, wie Archelaos, verständig zwar sind, doch nicht stolzer als ein Unbegüterter ..." (705 n. 8): this, however, seems rather farfetched and not really a suitable explanation of 1; (2) Duentzer's φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδὲν τῶν γε χρημάτων ὕπερ: this is more attractive, because of the

contrast φρονοῦςι μὲν ..., / φρονοῦςι δ' οὐδὲν, which recalls such passages as *Ba.* 332 φρονῶν οὐδὲν φρονεῖς, fr. 1063, 11 μάταιός ἐςτι καὶ φρονῶν οὐδὲν φρονεῖ, and may well be expanded with the addition τῶν γε χρημάτων ὕπερ: 'but do not use their intelligence on behalf of their *money*' (this is my interpretation, for which one may compare Eupolis fr. 352 [1, 351 Kock] μιςῶ δὲ καὶ τὸν Cωκράτην, τὸν πτωχὸν ἀδολέςχην, / ὃς τἄλλα μὲν πεφρόντικεν, / ὁπόθεν δὲ καταφαγεῖν ἔχοι τούτου κατημέληκεν [I owe this reference to D. Holwerda]; Duentzer paraphrases: "dicit poeta se eos contemnere, qui re vera quidem sapiant, sed ob divitias, quibus unica contineatur sapientia [he compares fr. 580, 3-5], deficientes nihil sapiant"); and (3) Munro's φρονοῦςι δ' οὔ, δέον γε, χρημάτων ὕπερ: "who are men of thought, but take no thought, tho' they ought to, for riches" (Munro), but the absolute use of the part. neutr. δέον seems to be confined to comedy and prose-texts (cf. LSJ s.v. δεῖ IV).

None of these attempts is quite convincing, and the corruption may well lie much deeper.

fr. 249 = 23 A

This fragment has been generally and with some plausibility attributed to the scene where Kisseus is persuaded to break his promise to Archelaos (see lit. mentioned on fr. 246): the fragment may well contain a warning against giving Archelaos his promised rewards (μὴ πλούςιον θῇς). Although there is no explicit mention of riches in test. 7, it seems probable that they went with the kingdom and the king's daughter.

1 μὴ πλούςιον θῇς: as the object of this command is described as poor and noble in 1 ff., it seems likely that he must be identified with Archelaos (or, if the fragment comes from a speech of a general nature, with 'a man like Archelaos' adduced as a warning example). For poverty and εὐγένεια as 'characteristics' of Archelaos see comm. on fr. 232.

ἐνδεέςτερος: the comp. only here in Euripides; it is probably best taken to mean 'poor' here. On this 'contrasting' use of the comparative see KG 2, 305 ff.; Schwyzer 2, 183 f.

2 ταπεινὸς: the association of poverty and humility is of course not surprising and we find it alluded to on several occasions; cf. e.g. *Andr.* 164 f. δεῖ c'ἀντὶ τῶν πρὶν ὀλβίων φρονημάτων / πτῆξαι ταπεινήν, fr. 81 ταπεινὰ γὰρ χρὴ τοὺς κακῶς πεπραγότας / λέγειν, ἐς ὄγκον δ' οὐκ ἄνω βλέπειν τύχης, Pl. *R.* 8, 553 c 2, Antiphanes fr. 167 (2, 79 Kock), Men. fr. 113, 1 f. Austin; cf. also the observations in Thgn. 173 ff. ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν πενίη πάντων δάμνηςι μάλιςτα, ... καὶ γὰρ ἀνὴρ πενίῃ δεδμημένος οὔτε τι εἰπεῖν / οὔτ' ἔρξαι δύναται, γλῶςςα δέ οἱ δέδεται; Hemelrijk 101 f.

κεῖνο: cf. comm. on fr. 232, 3.

ἰcχύει μέγα: for the expression cf. *Andr.* 332 τοῦτο δ' ἰcχύει μέγα (but see Stevens ad loc. for the authenticity of the passage), 1109 μῦθος ἰcχύων μέγα, fr. 200, 1 f., 343. For the idea that wealth is powerful cf. e.g. in Euripides *Ph.* 438 ff. πάλαι μὲν οὖν ὑμνηθέν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐρῶ· / τὰ χρήματ' ἀνθρώποιcι τιμιώτατα, / δύναμίν τε πλείcτην τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἔχει, *El.* 427 ff., fr. 642; and elsewhere: Thgn. 717 ff., S. F 88, 1 ff. (describing the power and influence which are the results of being rich), Diphilus fr. 103 (2, 573 Kock).

3 πλοῦτος λαβὼν ⟨τε⟩ τοῦτον εὐγενὴς ἀνήρ: ⟨τε⟩ has been inserted by Gesner and generally accepted as required by metre and sense (and of course it could have dropped out easily before τοῦτον). Now in the previous line κεῖνο δ' ἰcχύει μέγα indicates that what follows must be regarded as *one* thing, not as two separate unities, and the interpretation which springs to mind when one reads the line is 'riches, and those in the possession of a noble man', or yet more freely 'the combination of wealth and nobility'. For τε thus very closely connecting two things cf. Ruijgh 170 ff.

The use of οὗτος here recalls the use of οὗτος in such expressions as καὶ οὗτος, which can be used to heighten the impact of a previous word (cf. KG 1, 647, 8; LSJ s.v. οὗτος C V), and καὶ ταῦτα which, in a similar way, heightens the impact of a preceding verb (cf. LSJ s.v. οὗτος C VIII 2). But I have found no parallel for οὗτος τε = καὶ οὗτος, and indeed, what we want here is not so much that λαβὼν—ἀνήρ adds an extra dimension to πλοῦτος, but rather that it is the combination of wealth and nobility which is powerful. (Single τε in a comparable sense is claimed by Denniston 502 for Lys. 13, 40 πυθομένη δ'ἐκείνη ἀφικνεῖται, μέλαν τε ἱμάτιον ἠμφιεcμένη, but the text has been generally suspected).

fr. 250 = 24 A

This fragment too has been attributed to the plotting-scene (see lit. quoted on fr. 246), but its contents are far too general to justify such conclusions, and I can see no way of deciding whether the speaker approves of this public opinion (νομίζεται see comm. below) or rather dissociates himself from it. Lowicka's idea that Kisseus decides to kill Archelaos, "excusing himself by the necessity of keeping the royal power" (which he considers the most precious of treasures) is just one of a number of possibilities (Lowicka 269).

As to the thought in this fragment the closest parallel seems to be provided by *Hec.* 354 ff. (Polyxena:) δέcποινα ... ἦ ... ἴcη θεοῖcι πλὴν τὸ κατθανεῖν μόνον: the speaker compares her royal position to that of the gods but also with the restriction that she is mortal. The idea of god-like tyranny recurs in *Tr.* 1169 τῆc ἰcοθέου τυραννίδος, where, however, no restrictions are mentioned. This latter passage has been said to be alluded to in Pl. *R.* 8, 568 b 3 f. καὶ ὡc ἰcόθεόν γ', ἔφη, τὴν τυραννίδα ἐγκωμιάζει καὶ ἕτερα πολλά, καὶ

οὗτος (sc. Euripides) καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ποιηταί (so Adam ad loc.; Lee on *Tr.* 1169; though Nestle[1] 521 n. 38 made it refer to our fragment); but, as ἰσόθεος is a word which is by no means rare, neither in prose nor in poetry, it may well be chosen by Plato simply as a short and convenient means of expressing himself (the same word is used by Isoc. 2, 5 in a similar context, but without reference to E. or other poets), thereby also covering the other — and more important — passages in which Euripides mentions tyranny favourably (*Ph.* 506; 524 f.; fr. 15; 332, 7). Of course Plato's criticism was by no means fair, as one could just as easily adduce a number of passages in which E.'s characters blame and reject tyranny (e.g. *Hipp.* 1013 ff., *Su.* 429 ff., *Ion* 621 ff., fr. 275; 286, 5 ff.), and it needs no arguing that one cannot claim any of these passages, neither *pro* nor *contra*, as Euripides' personal opinion. Cf. on this fragment also Van Groningen 516 f. (= 42 f.).

1 τυραννίδ': the acc. must be dependent on something in the preceding lines, so that the fragment is not grammatically self-contained. This type of ecloga is not very frequent in Stobaeus, but we may compare fr. 29, 1 f. σιγᾶν φρονοῦντα κρείσσον' εἰς ὁμιλίαν / πεσόντα (⟨φήμ'ἐγώ⟩ coni. Gomperz), 93, 1 f. ἀεὶ δ' ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κρατοῦσι· ταῦτα γὰρ / δούλοις ἄριστα (μέλου pro ἀεί coni. Schmidt), 532, 1 f. τοὺς ζῶντας εὖ δρᾶν· κατθανὼν δὲ πᾶς ἀνὴρ / γῆ καὶ σκιά, 212 ff. εἰ νοῦς ἔνεστιν· εἰ δὲ μή, τί δεῖ καλῆς / γυναικὸς ...;

θεῶν δευτέρα: 'second to the gods'; for δεύτερος thus connected with a gen. comp. cf. Hdt. 1, 23 κιθαρῳδὸν τῶν τότε ἐόντων οὐδενὸς δεύτερον (sc. Arion), D. 19, 24 πάντα γὰρ τἄλλ', οἶμαι, τότε δεύτερ' ἦν τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσδοκιῶν καὶ τῶν ἐλπίδων. In tragedy δεύτερος occurs in this sense e.g. in S. *Ph.* 1442 f. τἄλλα πάντα δεύτερ'ἡγεῖται πατὴρ / Ζεύς, *OC* 351 f., E. *Hipp.* 508 (all abs.); S. F 354, 4 f. κἄστι πρὸς τὰ χρήματα / θνητοῖσι τἄλλα δεύτερ' (+ prep.). For contrast cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 248 e 3, where the tyrant's life is placed lowest in the classification of human ways of life (i.e. on the ninth place!). As to the text, Gaisford's explanation of $\bar{\beta}$ was obviously right; this way of abbreviating ordinals was already common on papyri; cf. intr. *Kresphontes* 3.1. Cf. also A. Nauck, Mél. Gr.-Rom. 5, 1888, 212 f. n. 53 and 54.

νομίζεται: of public opinion also e.g. *Alc.* 528, *Heracl.* 201, 596, *Hel.* 300, fr. 638, 2. The general view of tyranny as a blessed thing is well described in Isoc. 2, 5 ὅταν μὲν γὰρ ἀποβλέψωσιν εἰς τὰς τιμὰς καὶ τοὺς πλούτους καὶ τὰς δυναστείας, ἰσοθέους ἅπαντες νομίζουσι τοὺς ἐν ταῖς μοναρχίαις ὄντας.

2 τὰ δ'ἄλλ' ἔχει: although Grotius' correction is simple and may well be right (cf. *Hipp.* 1021 ἓν οὐ λέλεκται τῶν ἐμῶν, τὰ δ'ἄλλ' ἔχεις), Busche's conjecture, for which he quotes fr. 610 φθείρου· τὸ γὰρ δρᾶν οὐκ ἔχων λόγους ἔχεις as a parallel, is also worth considering, and perhaps gives a 'nicer' text; cf. also the way in which Euripides plays with different forms of ἔχω elsewhere: *Alc.* 352 δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν, *Ion* 1452 μῶν οὐκ ἔχειν μ'ἔχουσα; *IT* 802, *Hel.* 35 f., 160 f.

τὰ ... ἄλλ': honour, wealth, power etc.; cf. Isoc. 2, 5 quoted above. The situation of the tyrants, who have everything except immortality is reminiscent of that of the god-like heroes in the *Iliad*, who cannot escape death either (cf. on these heroes Griffin 82 f.).

fr. 251 = 25 A

This fragment, too, has been generally attributed to the plotting-scene (see lit. quoted on fr. 246), but the only thing one can infer from the text is that it seems to refer to Archelaos, because: (1) κρείccω may well refer to Archelaos, who by defeating the enemy had actually proved to be 'better' than Kisseus, whose attempts had apparently failed (cf. test. 7), (2) τρέφειν ἐν οἴκοις could be considered to go with the promised rewards (kingdom and daughter). The idea that the lines were spoken by someone who was persuading Kisseus to get rid of Archelaos is plausible, but by no means cogent.

1 κρείccω: Pflugk's correction, for which he quoted fr. 51 δούλους γὰρ οὐ / καλὸν πεπᾶcθαι κρείccονας τῶν δεcποτῶν and fr. 206, 5 f. ἐγὼ τὰ πράγματα / κρείccω νομίζω τῶν λόγων ἀεί ποτε (κρείccω Clem. Alex.: κρεῖccον Stob.), has been generally accepted. The mss.' κρεῖccον has been defended only by Ellis 257, who takes it to mean 'a stronger thing'; but cf. KG 1, 58 ff. whose examples of this use of the adj. neutr. are all from expressions of a general nature, in which it forms the pred. to a masc./fem. subject (like e.g. *Med.* 329, *Hipp.* 109 f. etc.). Besides, the corruption seems easy to explain: the copyist may have subconsciously expected κρεῖccον γὰρ (sc. ἐcτι) followed by an inf. construction, which is of course quite common (cf. e.g. *Med.* 290, *Hipp.* 186, *Andr.* 778 etc.).

οὔτε δοῦλον οὔτ'ἐλεύθερον: i.e. nobody at all; for the structure of the line cf. *Hec.* 1181 f. γένος γὰρ οὔτε πόντος οὔτε γῆ τρέφει / τοιόνδε, *Hel.* 257 γυνὴ γὰρ οὔθ' Ἑλληνὶς οὔτε βάρβαρος (though the line is probably not authentic; cf. Kannicht ad loc.); on this kind of polar expression see Wilamowitz on *HF* 1106; Breitenbach 203 f.; Fehling 274 ff. The same pair as in our fragment appears also in Th. 2, 78, 4 καὶ ἄλλος οὐδεὶς ἦν ἐν τῶι τείχει οὔτε δοῦλος οὔτ' ἐλεύθερος.

2 τρέφειν ἐν οἴκοις: at the background of this expression one may detect the popular contrast in the behaviour of animals which are kept and fed in the house as pets and subsequently turn against their masters. This motif is on the one hand applied in a literal sense: for pathetic effect of the dogs of Priam, who may devour him after his death (*Il.* 22, 66 ff.; cf. esp. 22, 69 [the dogs] οὓς τρέφον ἐν μεγάροισι τραπεζῆας θυραωρούς) and in a threat in *Od.* 21, 363 f. τάχ' αὖ c'ἐφ'ὕεσσι κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται / οἶον ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὓς ἔτρεφες. In E. we may compare *Hipp.* 1355 ff. ὦ στυγνὸν ὄχημ' ἵππειον, ἐμῆς / βόσκημα χερός, / διά μ'ἔφθειρας, κατὰ δ'ἔκτεινας; cf. also the well-

known story of Aktaion, who was devoured by his own dogs (referred to in e.g. *Ba.* 337 ff. ὁρᾶις τὸν Ἀκτέωνος ἄθλιον μόρον, / ὃν ὠμόσιτοι σκύλακες ἃς ἐθρέψατο / διεσπάσαντο). On the other hand the motif is found in the fable of the young lion, brought up in the house and afterwards turning out to be an all-devouring monster (the lion standing metaphorically for some dangerous and powerful person[s]), of which the most elaborate version is found in A. *Ag.* 717 ff. (cf. Fraenkel on 736) and which is later referred to in E. *Su.* 1222 ff. πικροὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἥξετ' ἐκτεθραμμένοι / σκύμνοι λεόντων, πόλεος ἐκπορθήτορες, Ar. *Ra.* 1431 οὐ χρὴ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν, Pl. *Grg.* 483 e 5 f.; similarly with a reference to wolfcubs Theoc. 5, 38 θρέψαι καὶ λυκιδεῖς, θρέψαι κύνας, ὥς τυ φάγωντι (where see Gow). The same contrast seems to be alluded to in Hdt. 1, 44, 2 οἰκίοισι ὑποδεξάμενος τὸν ξεῖνον (sc. Adrastos) φονέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλάνθανε βόσκων (sc. Kroisos), S. *Ant.* 532 f. οὐδ' ἐμάνθανον / τρέφων δύ' ἄτα κἀπαναστάσεις θρόνων, Ar. *Eq.* 1125 ff. (cf. Pl. *R.* 8, 565 c 9 f.), 1037 ff. and possibly in our fragment (cf. also Bengl 85 n. 1).

οὔτε ... ἀσφαλὲς τοῖς σώφροσιν: here we find two things expressed in a very compact way: (1) it is not safe (for anybody) to ..., (2) sensible people do not ...

fr. 252 = 26 A

The interpretation of this fragment is made difficult because of textual uncertainties, which is all the more to be regretted because the contents, as far as we have them, look rather interesting: on the one hand they seem to recall the philosophic discussions on the importance of νόμοι (see comm.), on the other hand one may detect here the topos of justice leading to prosperity (and, perhaps, fertility, but this is more hypothetical and partly depends on [a] the exact meaning of ταὐξήματα, [b] the contents of the gap in 2 — both uncertain factors; see comm.).

Perhaps one may relate this fragment to fr. 250 and infer that the *Archelaos* contained a discussion on tyrannis *versus* νόμοι (in which also frs. 235 and 248 could belong, as riches were closely associated with tyranny; cf. e.g. S. *OT* 541 f., Anon. Jambl. 89, 7, 13 [2, 404, 20 ff. DK]; with 3 cf. also fr. 256). For other attempts to interpret and locate the fragment cf. Welcker 3, 1596, Van Herwerden[2] 336, Lowicka 269.

1 ἐκ τῶν δικαίων: the ms. has ει̣̣ and the dots seem to indicate that the scribe himself regarded it as wrong (Schneidewin 74), and indeed it is hard to see how it could be constructed here. Meineke's ἐκ has been generally accepted and makes good sense: instrumental ἐκ (on which see LSJ s.v. III 6) would imply the idea of 'the laws producing growth by means of justice', which seems quite conceivable. Ranke's οἱ is more difficult (though ει̣̣ could

then be easily explained as an itacistic or transcription-error), because the idea of 'the laws of the just' would imply the existence of 'laws of the unjust', which looks like a *contradictio in terminis*. Still, without context, this argument cannot be regarded as fatal to οἱ.

γὰρ: on the position of γὰρ see Denniston 96.

νόμοι: 'laws' (on this meaning of the plural cf. e.g. Heinimann 123; M. Pohlenz, *NOMOS*, Phil. 97, 1948, 135-142 = *Kleine Schriften* 2, Hildesheim 1965, 333-340). The association with τὰ δίκαια (or τὸ δίκαιον or δίκη) is very common and well attested especially in philosophic texts (on the relation of Dike and Nomos see Pohlenz o.c. 137 [= 335]). Cf. e.g. Hes. *Th.* 901 f., where Dike is called a sister of Eunomia and Eirene (see West ad loc.), *Orph.* fr. 105 b Kern: Dike as a daughter of Nomos and Eusebeia; E. *Hec.* 799 ff. (on which see Heinimann 121; D. Lanza, *NOMOC e ICON in Euripide*, RFIC 91, 1963, 416-439); Gorg. 82 B 11 a (2, 301, 25 f. DK) νόμουϲ τε γραπτοὺϲ φύλακαϲ [τε] τοῦ δικαίου, Anon. Jambl. 89, 3, 6 τοῖϲ νόμοιϲ τε καὶ τῶι δικαίωι 6, 1; 6, 3; 6, 5 etc. (2, 401 ff. DK), Tit. Archyt. 47 B 9 (1, 439, 26 DK), Archel. 60 A 1 (2, 45, 3 DK), Lykophron 83, 3 (2, 307, 26 DK); Lys. 2, 19; [D.] 25, 16; Pl. *Prt.* 327 a-b; D. Chr. 1, 74 f.; cf. Guthrie 68 ff. This close connection of νόμοι and τὰ δίκαια is one reason why Gomperz' νομοί is not very attractive. Another reason is that it seems difficult to regard νομοί 'meadows, places of pasturage' (cf. LSJ s.v. I 1) as the subject of ταὐξήματα / μεγάλα φέρουϲι: one would really expect a word like ἄρουρα or γῆ or χθών (cf. *Od.* 4, 229 f. τῆι πλεῖϲτα φέρει ζείδωροϲ ἄρουρα / φάρμακα, Hes. *Op.* 237; E. *Hec.* 592 f., *Hel.* 1265).

The emphasis here laid on νόμοι and τὰ δίκαια would well fit a speech directed against (a defence of) tyranny, which we find often mentioned in opposition to law and justice and associated with ἀνομία and ἀδικία, cf. in Euripides esp. *Su.* 429 ff. (where see Collard); further Dionysius *TrGF* 1, 76 F 4 ἡ γὰρ τυραννὶϲ ἀδικίαϲ μήτηρ ἔφυ; examples from Hdt. in Adkins 216 n. 8; Anon. Jambl. 89, 7, 12 (2, 404, 16 f. DK) γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἡ τυραννίϲ, κακὸν τοϲοῦτόν τε καὶ τοιοῦτον, οὐκ ἐξ ἄλλου τινὸϲ ἢ ἀνομίαϲ; D. Chr. 1, 82: Anomia among the attendants of Tyrannis; cf. also Aeschin. 1, 4 ff. (importance of νόμοι for democracy). For the exact nature of the opposition and further literature see Stinton apud C. Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, Groningen 1975, 440 ff.

ταὐξήματα: Schneidewin's interpretation as ταὐξήματα is preferable to the ms. τ'αὐξήματα where τε seems intractable (although it was generally accepted until Austin). The word αὔξημα occurs elsewhere in Euripides only in *Hyps.* I, II 5 αὔξημα τὸ ϲὸν (Hypsipyle addressing the baby Opheltes), where Bond remarks: "αὔξημα is a medical term denoting natural growth". This obviously suits the *Hypsipyle*-passage and the only other instance of the word quoted in LSJ and *ThLG* s.v.: Hp. *Oct.* 11, 1 οὐκ αὐξήματοϲ, ἀλλ'

οἰδήματος (of babies suddenly getting fat). Yet, if we compare the use of the verb αὐξάνω, αὔξω it is at once apparent that this can be used of the increase of all sorts of things, where a connotation of natural growth is often not or hardly felt; e.g. Hdt. 7, 16 α 2 γνωμέων δύο προκειμένων Πέρσῃσι, τῆς μὲν ὕβριν αὐξανούσης, Th. 1, 69, 4 τὴν αὔξησιν τῶν ἐχθρῶν; A. *Pe.* 756 πατρῷον δ' ὄλβον οὐδὲν αὐξάνειν, S. *Ant.* 191 τοιοῖσδ' ἐγὼ νόμοισι τήνδ' αὔξω πόλιν, E. *IA* 571 f. κόσμος ... μείζω πόλιν αὔξει, fr. 364 ἐκ τῶν πόνων τοι τἀγάθ' αὔξεται βροτοῖς. It is therefore conceivable that ταὐξήματα are in our fragment increases in a general sense, not merely those which are the result of natural growth, an interpretation which also fits in nicely with the general χρήματα in 3.

If it could be shown that αὔξημα can only be used of natural growth, this would be an extra point in favour of Gomperz' idea that our fragment reflects the topos of justice (of the ruler) leading to prosperity and fertility, but even without this the idea can still be maintained (so also Ferrari 232 n. 2). Cf. for this topos in a more elaborate form *Od.* 19, 109 ff., Hes. *Op.* 225 ff. (more examples in West on 225-47); discussion of these passages in Pl. *R.* 2, 363 a 7 ff. Whether ταὐξήματα has to be taken in the abstract sense 'growth, increases' or in a concrete sense of 'the increments' cannot be decided (cf. on the various possibilities with subst. in -μα Chantraine 183 ff.).

2 ⟨⏑ –⟩: the gap has been filled in in several ways, a number of which can be rejected because the structure of the sentence seems to demand either a verb (or pred. + ἐστι understood) of which πάντα is the subject or a verb of which the νόμοι are the subject and πάντα the object (but this seems more difficult to realize). So, only a few of the many conjectures deserve closer attention:

(1) ⟨βρύει⟩ Gomperz: although the verb can be used absolutely and in a sense which might fit the presumed context (cf. LSJ s.v. 3 "abound, grow luxuriantly"), it is usually constructed with a dative, so that after ἀνθρώποις the interpretation which first springs to mind would be 'teems with people', which does not seem to be what is required by the context.

(2) ⟨ἴσα⟩ Walker[1], and after him Ferrari 232 f., who takes it in a pred. sense: "tutte le cose sono uguali per gli uomini": this conjecture has much to recommend it: (a) the notion of ἰσότης may well figure in a context which defends τὰ δίκαια and νόμοι; cf. for similar associations of these things e.g. *Su.* 429 ff. (with Collard's notes), *Ph.* 535 ff., both in arguments against tyrannis, (b) the loss of ἴσα could be easily explained as caused by haplography after ἀνθρώποις (cf. Ferrari 232).

As to the exact connotation ἴσα would have here one can merely guess: in view of ταὐξήματα / μεγάλα and χρήματ' in 3 one might expect that the connotation of the equal distribution of goods would be prominent; the fragment could then contain an attack on πλεονεξία, which is one of the

characteristics of a tyrant; a similar association of ideas is found in *Su.* 450f., *Ph.* 535ff.; cf. also Anon. Jambl. 89, 7, 1f. (2, 403, 15ff. DK) on equal distribution of goods as a result of εὐνομία. Alternatively one may consider Ferrari's interpretation, who paraphrases: "la giustizia regna fra gli uomini", comparing LSJ s.v. ἴcoc II 2 'based on equality of rights' (Ferrari 233 + n. 1), which suggests the notion of ἰcoνομία; cf. e.g. *Hec.* 805, *Su.* 432; and for the association with νόμοι also Aeschin. 1, 5 τὴν ἴcην καὶ ἔννομον πολιτείαν. For the expression one may compare *HF* 633 πάντα τἀνθρώπων ἴcα, *Hec.* 805, fr. 1048, 1; *Ph.* 501.

Even so, I am not quite convinced that ἴcα really fits the context of this particular fragment, as I would like to interpret it (admittedly the argument is subjective): the speaker is obviously arguing that justice and piety lead to an increase of wealth (χρήματα must be some concrete possessions, cf. Arist. *EN* 4, 1, 2, 1119 b 26f. χρήματα δὲ λέγομεν πάντα ὅcων ἡ ἀξία νομίcματι μετρεῖται); *if* the fragment comes from an agonistic context, where the defender of law and justice finds himself confronted with a person of tyrannical disposition, inclined towards πλεονεξία, the insertion of equal division seems to weaken the statement and make the νόμοι less attractive to this particular person. An alternative solution might be πάντα δ'ἀνθρώποιc ⟨ἔφυ⟩; cf. *Hipp.* 448 Κύπριc, πάντα δ'ἐκ ταύτηc ἔφυ.

3 τάδ' ἐcτι χρήματ': following 1-2 asyndetically as in e.g. *Heracl.* 591, *Hipp.* 236. The contents of τάδ' are given in the conditional clause ἤν τιc εὐcεβῆι θεόν, which has apparently an epexegetic function; similarly *Hipp.* 236f. τάδε μαντείαc ἄξια πολλῆc, / ὅcτιc cε θεῶν ἀναcειράζει and with epexegetic inf. *Med.* 743, 935, *Hipp.* 475, fr. 1078; for τάδε explained in a conditional clause cf. esp. *Od.* 24, 433ff. See further KG 1, 658f. on this preparative use of the demonstr. (more examples of epexegetic subordinate clauses on p. 659).

As was also observed by Gomperz 1, 182, there is no need to believe that there is a lacuna between 2 and 3 (so Meineke 4 XLIV and after him Mette[5] 88 [F 313]: "am Schluss von v. 2 fehlt ⟨⏑×⟩ und dann mindestens noch ein ganzer Trimeter"), because respect for law and justice on the one hand and εὐcέβεια on the other are often associated with each other and even treated as equivalents: cf. *HF* 772f. θεοὶ θεοὶ / τῶν ἀδίκων μέλουcι καὶ τῶν ὁcίων ἐπάιειν; *Ba.* 995f. τὸν ἄθεον ἄνομον ἄδικον 'Εχίονοc / γόνον γηγενῆ; Th. 5, 104 ὅτι ὅcιοι πρὸc οὐ δικαίουc ἱcτάμεθα (sc. the Melians, apparently treating the words as synonymous; cf. Gomme-Andrewes-Dover ad. loc.), Pl. *R.* 2, 363 a 7ff.; though a distinction as to genus and species is made in Pl. *Euthphr.* 11 e 2ff. (cf. 12 e 5 τὸ μέροc τοῦ δικαίου εἶναι εὐcεβέc τε καὶ ὅcιον); cf. Van Groningen 524f. (= 50f.); Adkins 133ff.; 149 n. 3; D. Loenen, *Eusebeia en de cardinale deugden*, Med. Kon. Ned. Akad. v. Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 23 nr. 4, Amsterdam 1960, 84ff. (= 14ff.).

θεόν: Nauck wished to change θεόν into θεούς, apparently considering θεόν as a monotheistic corruption (cf. on this type of corruptions in Stob. Luria 225; in general M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973, 18). Still, the change does not seem to be necessary as we have many instances of the singular thus used in a general sense; cf. e.g. *Alc.* 514, *Med.* 1418, *El.* 1169, frs. 82, 100, 103 etc.

εὐσεβῆι θεόν: though transitive εὐσεβεῖν is less common than intransitive, it is certain in *Tr.* 85 f. ὡς ἂν τὸ λοιπὸν τἄμ' ἄνακτορ' εὐσεβεῖν / εἰδῶσ' Ἀχαιοί θεούς τε τοὺς ἄλλους σέβειν (where see Lee) and Antipho 3, 3, 11 οὔθ' οἱ θανατώσαντες ἡμᾶς ... εὐσεβοῖντ' ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπολυσάντων τοὺς ἀνοσίους; possible in A. *Ag.* 338 εἰ δ' εὐσεβοῦσι τοὺς ... θεούς, E. *Ph.* 1321, *Hyps.* I, V 21 (though in these latter passages, as well as in our fragment, it is equally possible to take ΕΥΣΕΒΟΥΣΙ etc. as εὖ σέβουσι etc.; cf. Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 338).

fr. 253 = 27 A

The gnomic nature of the fragment makes all attempts at location purely hypothetical. For some attempts cf. Welcker 2, 708, Van Herwerden[2] 337 f., Lowicka 269.

1 ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος: this and similar expressions can be used in apposition with short, emphatic statements or commands, as in e.g. A. *Ch.* 554 ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος· τήνδε μὲν στείχειν ἔσω, E. *Hel.* 979 κἀκεῖνον ἢ 'μὲ δεῖ θανεῖν· ἁπλοῦς λόγος, *Or.* 446, 758, fr. 68; cf. also *Rh.* 84 ἁπλοῦς ἐπ' ἐχθροῖς μῦθος ὁπλίζειν χέρα and the expression ἁπλῶι λόγωι (e.g. A. *Pr.* 46, 610, 975, Ar. *Ach.* 1151). The interpretation of our line would then be: 'the word (command?) is simple: don't speak well', so that ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος merely defines the nature of the following command (which is very simple indeed).

Two interpretations suggested by Van Herwerden are less likely: (1) Van Herwerden[1] 40: the idea that the preceding line ended with ⟨τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ⟩, for which he compared *Ph.* 469 ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ (cf. also A. fr. 176). But it seems hardly likely that a sentence would be cut in such a way (even though anthologists were capable of many things); (2) Van Herwerden[2] 337: his interpretation 'Eenvoudig zij uw taal' (i.e. 'Let your speech be simple'), which implies that there were two separate commands in asyndetical arrangement; here the difficulty is that one would then have to supply an imperative ⟨ἔστω⟩ instead of simple ⟨sc. ἐστι⟩, a practice for which KG 1, 41 f. Anm. 2 (e) quote only X. *An.* 3, 3, 14 τοῖς οὖν θεοῖς χάρις (and similar passages in X.), rejecting this interpretation in *Il.* 13, 95 and S. *OC* 1480.

μὴ λέγ' εὖ: 'dont't speak well', obviously referring to the skill with which the person addressed may be inclined to speak; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 487. For the contrast between skilful speech and bad results (2 βλάβην) (or deeds or

thoughts or contents of the speech), which is popular in Euripides, cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 503 εὖ λέγεις γάρ, αἰσχρὰ δέ, *Ph.* 526 οὐκ εὖ λέγειν χρὴ μὴ 'πὶ τοῖς ἔργοις καλοῖς, *Med.* 576ff., *Tr.* 967f., *Ba.* 266ff., *IA* 1115f., fr. 206, 1f., 528, 2, 583 and Hekabe's protests in *Hec.* 1187ff.; Di Benedetto 85ff.; on "mistrust of practised speakers" in general see Dover 25f.

2 εἰ φέρει τινὰ βλάβην: whether the damage is to the speaker himself (so Grotius[1] 140) or to others (so Matthiae 92, rejecting the interpretation of Grotius) or generally to all people concerned, cannot be discovered for lack of context.

Snell's transposition into βλάβην τινά does not seem to be necessary; on the position of τις (which 'officially' should follow the subst. as an enclitic, but often precedes it) cf. KG 1, 665f. Perhaps Bothe's τινὶ βλάβην still deserves some attention: it recalls the well-known use of τις in threats, where the pronoun is really used of the person addressed (e.g. *Andr.* 577 πρὶν κλαίειν τινά, *Ion* 1311, A. *Th.* 402, S. *Ai.* 1138, *Ant.* 751, Ar. *Ra.* 552, 554 etc; cf. KG 1, 662, 1). Although in none of the examples τις stands, like here, in a conditional clause, I cannot help finding the suggestion rather attractive, as the fragment obviously contains a warning; if so, one could perhaps improve on Bothe by transposing βλάβην τινί: cf. the position of this τις in the examples quoted above, where it always stands at the end of a line or before a pause. But, of course, all this is highly hypothetical.

fr. 254 = 28 A

The context in Plutarch (as well as the text of the fragment) makes it clear that the line must be divided between two speakers: Plutarch is quoting three passages in which a 'bad' statement is answered by a 'good' statement; cf. Bond on *Hyps.* fr. I, V 20f. As to the speakers, the current view is that the first line was spoken by Kisseus (blaming the gods either for the fact that he has been led to break his promise towards Archelaos [so Welcker 2, 707, Van Herwerden[2] 337] or for his failure in the war [so Webster 256, Lowicka 267]), but, although the idea is quite plausible, this does not seem to exhaust the possibilities, as accusation of the gods is not restricted to speeches of self-defence. Some alternative possibilities are therefore: (1) Kisseus is defended by another person (e.g. the slave), (2) the statement is meant as a comfort to the person addressed, who then indignantly rejects such an easy comfort in 2 (if so, one could conceive of various pairs of speakers, provided that the speaker of 1 would be the elder), (3) the accusation is of a general nature (for details see below on αἰτιάσασθαι θεούς). ὦ τέκνον may refer to Archelaos, who in that case speaks 2 (see on 246, 1).

1 For the thought in this line cf. fr. 972 πολλαῖσι μορφαῖς οἱ θεοὶ σοφισμάτων / σφάλλουσιν ἡμᾶς κρείσσονες πεφυκότες, fr. 273.

σφάλλουσιν: the exact interpretation of this word has to remain obscure,

because we do not know the context. If one sticks to the idea that somebody is being defended here (either by himself or by another person), it is attractive to take cφάλλουcιν in the sense of 'delude, lead astray', as in e.g. *Andr.* 222 f. ἐγὼ τὴν cὴν χάριν / coὶ καὶ ξυνήρων, εἴ τί cε cφάλλοι Κύπρις, *Alc.* 34, *Hipp.* 1414, S. *Ai.* 452. On the other hand one can also take cφάλλουcιν in the sense of 'cause to fall, overthrow', implying not a mere delusion, but total destruction (cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 6 [Aphrodite:] cφάλλω δ'ὅcoι φρονοῦcιν εἰc ἡμᾶc μέγα, 871, *Med.* 198, fr. 273; LSJ s.v. II), in which case the line need not have been spoken in defence of somebody.

2 αἰτιάcαcθαι θεούc: the habit of blaming the gods, either in self-defence or to comfort another person, we find as early as Homer; cf. *Od.* 1, 32 ff. (Zeus:) ὢ πόποι, οἷον δή νυ θεοὺc βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται. / ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φαcι κάκ' ἔμμεναι· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ / cφῇcιν ἀταcθαλίῃcιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουcιν, *Il.* 19, 86 ff.; 270 ff. (Agamemnon and Achilles in self-defence); 3, 164 (Priam comforting Helen); cf. on these passages, where the blame of the gods goes much deeper than a simple excuse, Dodds 3 ff. In Euripides accusation of the gods (most often of a special god, who is blamed for what has happened) is quite a common feature: (1) in self-defence: e.g. *Cyc.* 285 θεοῦ τὸ πρᾶγμα· μηδέν' αἰτιῶ βροτῶν (Odysseus apologizing for the expedition against Troy), *Tr.* 948 ff., 1042 f. (Helen asking for forgiveness, because it was really the gods' fault; cf. *Od.* 23, 222), *Or.* 276, 285 ff., 591 ff. (Orestes blaming Apollo), (2) in comforts: e.g. *Hipp.* 1325 ff. (Artemis telling Theseus that not he, but Kypris is to blame), *Ion* 355, *El.* 1265 ff., *Or.* 75 f., (3) accusation of the gods or a god in a more general way, usually by people in wretched situations: e.g. *HF* 1087 f., *Ion* 252 ff., *Ph.* 379 ff., 1065 f., *Or.* 161 ff., (4) sometimes the person addressed and the gods are accused together: e.g. *HF* 1135, *IA* 411. It is tantalizing, in this respect, that we do not know more of the context of Kritias *TrGF* 1, 43 F 7, 26]δ̣ικώτ̣ατ' αἰτιᾶι θεούc ("either ἀ]δ. or ἐν]δ." Hunt on *POxy.* 17, 2078, 46, ἐν]δικ. or ἐκ]δικ. Körte).

For the idea that the gods must be blamed for the mistakes and disasters of mortals, cf. Nestle[1] 126 ff. (many passages from E.); on man's dependance of the gods in general Dodds 29 ff. After the fifth century we find the same idea expressed with reference to τύχη: e.g. fr. com. adesp. 255, 8 f. Austin cύ γε / τὸν π]όνον φεύγων προcάπτειc τῆι τύχηι τὴν αἰτίαν, cf. Men. *Comp.* 2, 15 Jaekel. In our fr., however, the words τὸ ῥᾶιcτον εἶπαc indicate that the excuse of the gods' fault is being rejected; a similar attitude we find in *Tr.* 983 ff., where Hekabe rejects Helena's accusation of Aphrodite; cf. A. Lesky in E. R. Schwinge (ed.), *Euripides* (WdF 89), Darmstadt 1968, 83 ff.

fr. 255 = 29 A

This fragment contains a warning against somebody who seems to expect that he may escape punishment. As Kisseus clearly figures as the villain of the

play, attempts at location are unanimous in making him the person who is addressed here, although they differ as to the actual scene in which the lines were spoken: (1) the plotting-scene (Webster 256, Lowicka 269, adding that the fragment is spoken by someone who is defending Archelaos), (2) a quarrel between Kisseus and Archelaos, when Kisseus is breaking his promise towards the latter (Welcker 3, 1597, Van Herwerden[2] 338 f.). But the summary in test. 7 does not seem to leave room for such a scene: it rather suggests that Kisseus breaks his promise not by means of a formal declaration, but merely by constructing the pit. Of course, considering the nature of the summaries in Hyginus, this argument cannot be decisive, but one could add that the sequence 'Kisseus arranges pitfall—Archelaos returns from the battle—slave warns Archelaos—Archelaos and Kisseus have their quarrel *arbitris semotis*—Kisseus is thrown into the pit' would seem dramatically more effective than a sequence in which the arrangement of the pitfall is preceded by a discussion between Archelaos and Kisseus in which Kisseus 'is breaking his promise', (3) Archelaos and Kisseus are having their secret talk just before Kisseus' punishment (Schneidewin 77, Hartung 2, 563), which, of the various suggestions, seems to be the most attractive, especially because of the tragic irony which could be detected if the lines were spoken near the pit, which would be just as 'near' and 'invisible' and 'unexpectedly working' as Dike (the ambiguity of the lines seems to have been noticed also by Hartung 2, 563 "... simulque poenam ei paratam esse tecte significatur hisce verbis"). Mette[5] 88 suggests that the fragment (his F 318) is from the same scene as fr. 254.

For the idea that the gods will look after the punishment of villains, cf. e.g. *Hec.* 1024 ff. (the chorus reflecting on the fate of Polymestor, which is about to be fulfilled), fr. 835; Nilsson[1] 1, 772.

1 τὰ ... ξυνετὰ: the plural at first sight strikes one as rather unusual (one would expect the singular τὸ cυνετόν 'the intelligence'; cf. e.g. *Or.* 1180 ἐπεὶ τὸ cυνετόν γ'οἶδα cῆι ψυχῆι παρόν, fr. 52, 9), and the text has been suspected by e.g. Blaydes 114, Walker[1] 12. But Blaydes' conjectures were rejected as unnecessary by E. Holzner, WS 17, 1895, 207, who quotes a letter from Gomperz: "Der Gedanke: 'Glaubst Du jemals die Götter an Einsicht zu besiegen', ist ein so völlig passender, dass man den nicht eben gewöhnlichen Plural ξυνετά statt ξυνετόν doch wohl mit in den Kauf nehmen muss". For similar use of the plural of neuter adj. one may compare e.g. *Ion* 450 f. εἰ τὰ τῶν θεῶν καλὰ / μιμούμεθ', *IA* 41 f. τῶν ἀπόρων οὐδενὸc ἐνδεῖc / μὴ οὐ μαίνεcθαι, 1370 τὰ ... ἀδύναθ'. On the distinction between sg. and pl. in this respect cf. KG 1, 268 Anm. 3. Perhaps τὰ ... ξυνετὰ has something to do with fr. 257, 2 ἥ τ' ἀξυνεcία: if we knew the exact relation between fr. 255 and fr. 257, it might become clear why Euripides chose the unorthodox plural instead of the sg.

The variant τὰ θεῶν cὺ ξυνετὰ is unlikely to be right, because of the word order and because it would imply synizesis of θεῶν after a short syllable in a very unusual position; cf. J. Diggle, PCPhS 20, 1974, 31 ff., who observes that there are only two instances of synizesis of θεόc in this position: *Andr.* 750 ὦ πρέcβυ, θεοί coι δοῖεν εὖ καὶ τοῖcι coῖc (perhaps to be cured by Rumpel's coὶ θεοί) and *IA* 1034f. εἰ δ' εἰcὶ θεοί, δίκαιοc ὢν ἀνὴρ ⟨θεῶν⟩ / ἐcθλῶν κυρήcειc (which may not be by Euripides [cf. Diggle o.c. 33 n. 1] and is not quite logical [Diggle o.c. 33 proposes to read εἰ δ' εἰcὶ ⟨cυνετοὶ⟩ θεοί; other conjectures in n. 2]); cf. also *Ion* 315 and *HF* 1228 (synizesis here introduced by conjecture, cf. Diggle o.c. 32 n. 7; Bond ad loc.). It is clear that this does not offer much support for δοκεῖc τὰ θεῶν cὺ ξυνετὰ (only *Andr.* 750 might be adduced; cf. Diggle o.c. 34), whereas δοκεῖc τὰ τῶν θεῶν would yield synizesis of θεῶν in a very common position (55 × out of 162 instances; cf. Diggle o.c. 32).

For cύνεcιc etc. used in connection with the gods cf. *HF* 655 εἰ δὲ θεοῖc ἦν ξύνεcιc, *IA* 1189f. On the meaning and on the frequency of cύνεcιc etc. in Euripides see B. Snell, *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff des Wissens*... (Phil. Unt. 29), Berlin 1924, 56f.

2 τὴν Δίκην: personification of Dike is common from Hes. *Th.* 902 onwards (cf. West ad loc., who gives further references and lit.) and very frequent in tragedy; cf. in Euripides e.g. *Med.* 764, 1390, *Hipp.* 1171, *El.* 771 (where see Denniston), 958 etc.; and see Thalheim in *RE* 5, 1905, 574ff. (s.v. Dike).

που μάκρ': Grotius' μάκρ' for the mss.' μακρὰν has been almost generally accepted. Yet one may wonder whether it would not be better to leave out που and accept μακράν γ' (Schneidewin-Nauck). Difficulties with μάκρ' are: (1) the way in which the word is used elsewhere: LSJ s.v. μακρόc I 3 give many examples, but all of them go with verbs of going, throwing or shouting (indicating the long distance which is covered by these actions, but not, as far as I can see, the distance which separates one thing from another), (2) we do not find μακ'ρ-, which is here demanded by metre, elsewhere in Euripidean dialogue (unless fr. 379 cκύφοc τε μακρόc is from dialogue, but here we cannot be sure), (3) μακρά is not elsewhere attested in Euripides, although we do sometimes find it as a variant reading (*Med.* 1351 [where see Page], *Tr.* 460, fr. 821, 2). μακράν on the other hand is well attested with verbs of rest where it may indicate the long distance which separates one thing or person from another (and can be constructed with a gen. sep.), cf. e.g. *IT* 629 μακρὰν γὰρ βαρβάρου ναίει χθονόc, *Ph.* 906, *Med.* 1157f.; Python *TrGF* 1, 91 F 1, 9; Th. 3, 55, 1. On this kind of 'feminine' adverb see Wilamowitz on *HF* 681, Page on *Med.* 1351, Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 916. A difficulty, however, is that we would have to delete που and add something like γ' after μακράν in order to avoid *caesura media* without elision (cf. Maas 66f.). Now γε emphasizing

μακράν seems quite conceivable (cf. Denniston 120f.), but I cannot very well see how που could be explained away. Still, considering the difficulties with μάκρ', I am inclined to prefer μακράν γ'.

ἀπῳκίσθαι: 'to live far away'; on the construction with gen. sep. see KG 1, 394ff.

3 ἐγγύς: for ἐγγύς of the 'presence' of gods or abstractions cf. Hes. *Op.* 249f. ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐόντες / ἀθάνατοι (and West ad loc.); *TrGF* 2, F 485 and 496 (ἐγγύθεν) and especially of the presence of Dike E. fr. 151 τήν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι ... / ἐγγύς τε ναίειν τῆς βροτῶν ἁμαρτίας, 506, 7f. ἀλλ' ἡ Δίκη / ἐνταῦθά πού 'στιν ἐγγύς, εἰ βούλεσθ' ὁρᾶν.

οὐχ ὁρωμένη δ' ὁρᾶι: play with two different forms of a verb was always popular in Greek and it often has a proverbial ring; cf. e.g. A. *Ag.* 340 οὔ τἂν ἑλόντες αὖθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν (and Fraenkel and Groeneboom ad loc.), 1623 (also with Fraenkel ad loc. and Strömberg 15); S. *OC* 1025 (where see Jebb) etc.; for other types of combination of different forms of the same verb see Fehling 266. Play with ὁράω in connection with 'all-seeing' gods we also find in fr. dub. et spur. 1129 = Philemon fr. dub. et spur. 247 (2, 539 Kock) θεὸν δὲ ποῖον, εἰπέ μοι, νοητέον; / τὸν πάνθ' ὁρῶντα καὐτὸν οὐχ ὁρώμενον (both Nauck and Kock agree with the view that the lines must be Christian), *TrGF* 2, F 493, 1 ὁρᾶις Δίκην ἄναυδον οὐχ ὁρωμένην, *AP* 7, 357 κἂν με (sc. a victim of murder) κατακρύπτηις, ὡς οὐδενὸς ἀνδρὸς ὁρῶντος, / ὄμμα Δίκης καθορᾶι πάντα τὰ γινόμενα; and in a different context *Ba.* 1050 (keeping quiet) ὡς ὁρῶιμεν οὐχ ὁρώμενοι.

In our fragment the two forms of ὁράω illustrate in a very compact way two important characteristics of Dike: (1) she moves without being seen (or heard, according to some sources); cf. e.g. Hes. *Op.* 223 (Dike) ἠέρα ἑσσαμένη (which of course indicates invisibility); Solon 4, 15f. σιγῶσα σύνοιδε τὰ γιγνόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα, / τῶι δὲ χρόνωι πάντως ἦλθ' ἀποτεισομένη; E. fr. 223, 1f. Δίκα χρόνιος, ἀλλ' ὅμως ὑποπεσοῦσ' / ἔλαθεν; 979; *TrGF* 2 F 493, 486, 3f.; (2) she sees everything; cf. e.g. *El.* 771 Δίκη ... πάνθ' ὁρῶσ', fr. 555, 2 ἀλλ' ἡ Δίκη γὰρ καὶ διὰ σκότου βλέπει; Dionysius *TrGF* 1, 76 F 5, *TrGF* 2, F 655, 19f.; cf. also A. *Ch.* 61ff., [D.] 25, 11 Δίκην, ἣν ... παρὰ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς θρόνον φησὶ (sc. Orpheus) καθημένην πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐφορᾶν. This notion is reflected in the expression 'the eye of Justice', which became proverbial and is first attested in S. F 12 τὸ χρύσεον δὲ τᾶς Δίκας / δέδορκεν ὄμμα, τὸν δ' ἄδικον ἀμείβεται (where see Pearson) and very often afterwards, cf. e.g. *AP* 7, 580, 2, Apostolius VI 8 (*CPGr* 2, 366, 6f.); more in Leutsch-Schneidewin ad loc. and in Thalheim *RE* 5, 1905, 576f. (s.v. Dike); the excellent eyesight of Dike is also illustrated by several epithets: πανδερκής, πανόψιος, πολυδερκής (cf. Bruchmann s.v. Dike; Thalheim l.c.). For contrast cf. *Ph.* 1726f. οὐχ ὁρᾶι Δίκα κακούς, / οὐδ' ἀμείβεται βροτῶν ἀσυνεσίας.

On the notion of the 'all-seeing god' in general cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 267 (who gives further literature); Kannicht-Snell on *TrGF* 2, F *43 and *421.

If this fragment is from the scene where Archelaos and Kisseus are speaking *arbitris semotis* not far from the pit, which is now waiting for Kisseus, there would be heavy tragic irony in the words ἐγγύϲ and οὐχ ὁρωμένη.

5 ὁπόταν ... διολέϲῃι: this construction after οἶϲθα was felt to be difficult by Wecklein and Van Herwerden², who both tried to solve the problem (Wecklein by changing the text, Van Herwerden by assuming a lacuna after 4). But, although the 'normal' construction would have been a simple future tense, subj. + ἄν seems well defensible: the subj. could convey the notion that it is *the speaker's expectation* that Justice will come. Cf. on this use of the prospective subj. (with or without ἄν) instead of ind. fut. in indirect questions Schwyzer 2, 312, who gives several examples from Homer (e.g. *Il.* 22, 130 εἴδομεν, ὁπποτέρωι κεν Ὀλύμπιοϲ εὖχοϲ ὀρέξῃι, *Od.* 23, 140), but observes that it is very rare in classical Greek (e.g. Th. 2, 52, 3 οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὐκ ἔχοντεϲ ὅ τι γένωνται); cf. also KG 1, 223 f. Considering that the *Archelaos* also shows such epic features as the gen. in -οιο in fr. 228, 3 (if it is sound) and epic τε in fr. 2, 13 A, I think our subj. + ἄν may well be protected by the Homeric parallels.

ἄφνω μολοῦϲα: another characteristic of Dike is her habit of appearing late; cf. Solon 4, 15 f. (quoted above); A. *Ch.* 935 ἔμολε μὲν Δίκα Πριαμίδαιϲ χρόνωι, E. *Heracl.* 941 εἷλέ ϲ' ἡ Δίκη χρόνωι, fr. 223, 835, 979, *TrGF* 2, F 483, 493 and the 'explanation' in Theodektes *TrGF* 1, 72 F 8; for a discussion on the apparent delay of divine vengeance cf. also the famous treatise Plu. *De sera numinis vindicta* (*Mor.* 548 a - 568 a; esp. 548 c ff.). This habit, too, was illustrated by epithets (βραδύπουϲ and ὀπιϲθόπουϲ; cf. Bruchmann s.v. Dike) and we also find it alluded to by Latin authors; cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3, 2, 31 f. *raro antecedentem scelestum / deseruit pede Poena claudo*, Tib. 1, 9, 4, *sera tamen tacitis Poena uenit pedibus*. Our fragment is a little different because Dike is said not to arrive *late*, but *suddenly*. It is easy to see, though, how the notion of a late arrival could lead to the notion of a sudden, unexpected arrival: after all those years one no longer expects punishment, and yet there it is, suddenly. In the context of the *Archelaos*, however, another explanation may be more attractive: if the lines refer to the actual punishment of Kisseus, which took place *unexpectedly* when he was thrown into the pit, they may contain a deliberate variation on the topos of Dike's late arrival, probably for the sake of tragic irony: if Archelaos spoke these lines to Kisseus near the pit, Kisseus may have understood ἄφνω as referring to an unexpected punishment sometime in the future, whereas Archelaos referred to an unexpected event within the next ten minutes or so.

κακούς: the generalizing plural is somewhat surprising after the emphatic cύ in 4 and the impression created by the preceding lines that this is a warning directed against the person addressed, not merely a general statement (as e.g. fr. 678 ἔcτι τοι καλὸν / κακοὺc κολάζειν). A way out of these difficulties would be to insert c' after ὁπόταν and accept Radt's κακῶc for κακούc.

fr. 256 = 30 A

The gnomic nature of this fragment makes all attempts at location extremely hazardous. It has generally been attributed to the 'good' party by those who made such attempts (e.g. Hartung 2, 563 Van Herwerden[2] 336 f. [chorus], Webster 256, Lowicka 269). But the fragment is not altogether easy to interpret. According to Nilsson[1] 1, 772 this is one of the passages in Euripides which reflect the old piety, and so it may well seem, but other notions may be present as well, as is apparent from the interpretations of (1) Nestle[1] 52: the fragment contains the Homeric idea that all men need the gods (cf. *Od.* 3, 48), to which a rational element (νοῦν ἔχων) has been added by Euripides; as in fr. 948 and 1025, the purpose of piety is to purchase an improvement of the external circumstances of one's life, and (2) McDonald 296: μακάριοc is here used of internal happiness (for details see comm.). A choice is by no means easy, especially because (a) μακάριοc can be used of internal as well as external happiness (cf. McDonald 296), (b) the impact of νοῦν ἔχων is not quite clear (see comm.), (c) κέρδοc could be used of material as well as of non-material gain, (d) αὑτῶι/αὐτῶι may be an uncertain factor, (e) ποιεῖται may be interpreted in different ways. It should be noticed, however, that if Nestle's interpretation is right, the fragment may well have a touch of opportunism and a 'bad' speaker cannot be excluded. With this fragment one may perhaps compare the gnomic prescripts in Chairemon *TrGF* 1, 71 F 14 b (but the remains are too scanty to be certain). For contrast cf. *TrGF* 2, F 181.

1 μακάριοc ὅcτιc: such formulas of μακαριcμόc are traditional in various genres of Greek poetry; cf. for an early example *Od.* 5, 306 f. τριcμάκαρεc Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκιc οἳ τότ' ὄλοντο / Τροίηι ἐν εὐρείηι; see further B. Snell, Hermes 66, 1931, 75 (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, Göttingen 1966, 85); Norden 100 n. 1 (both give many examples); Dodds on Ba. 72-75; Richardson on *hCer.* 480 (who gives also further literature). For μακάριοc thus used cf. e.g. fr. 793, 1 μακάριοc ὅcτιc εὐτυχῶν οἴκοι μένει, fr. 1057, 1 f. μακάριοc ὅcτιc εὐτυχεῖ γάμον λαβὼν / ἐcθλῆc γυναικόc (cf. *Cyc.* 495), Dicaeogenes *TrGF* 1, 52 F 2, Men. fr. 101, 1 Koerte, Men. *Mon.* 465, 471, 480, 489, 500, 507 Jaekel. The meaning of μακάριοc, which is first attested in Pi. *P.* 5, 46, is described by De Heer 52 as "being like μάκαρ, but to a less degree" and we find it always used of mortals who are for some reason raised above the ordinary level

(although its impact seems to have considerably weakened by the time of Menander; see the examples mentioned above), but not, in Vth century texts, of gods (cf. McDonald 16; 301 and id., ICS 4, 1979, 27-33). On its use in Euripides cf. De Heer 56f., 83ff., McDonald 296, 301ff. The word is not attested in A. and S.

According to McDonald's interpretation of the fragment μακάριοc would here be used to describe internal happiness. This notion first appears in the pre-Socratic philosophers (e.g. Democritus 68 B 40 [2, 155, 7 DK]) and then occurs several times in Euripides, eventually reaching its full development with Socrates (cf. McDonald 21ff.). In E. we could compare *Ion* 623ff. τίc γὰρ μακάριοc, τίc εὐτυχήc, / ὅcτιc δεδοικὼc καὶ παραβλέπων βίαν / αἰῶνα τείνει; *Ba.* 72ff., *IA* 543ff., fr. 198, 446, 910. Yet, μακάριοc can also be used of happiness derived from material sources, as in e.g. *El.* 709, *Tr.* 1170, *Or.* 86, fr. 793, 1 (cf. McDonald 296).

νοῦν ἔχων: 'having sense', often especially of the type of good sense that makes somebody do what is good and useful for himself; so e.g. *Andr.* 943ff. οὔποτ' ... / χρὴ τούc γε νοῦν ἔχονταc, οἷc ἔcτιν γυνή, / πρὸc τὴν ἐν οἴκοιc ἄλοχον ἐcφοιτᾶν ἐᾶν / γυναῖκαc· αὗται γὰρ διδάcκαλοι κακῶν, *Hipp.* 105 (where see Barrett); S. *El.* 1013f., 1464f.; Ar. *Ra.* 534ff. etc. This element of self-interest seems to be present in our fragment, too; cf. 2 αὑτῶι.

Without context the exact relation of νοῦν ἔχων to τιμᾶι θεὸν is hard to discover. With Nestle's interpretation: "Glückselig, wer verständig seinen Gott verehrt, das bringt ihm selber nur den grössten Nutzen ein", the participle seems to indicate a condition (cf. fr. 946 εὖ ἴcθ', ὅταν τιc εὐcεβῶν θύηι θεοῖc, / κἂν μικρὰ θύηι, τυγχάνει cωτηρίαc). With McDonald's it would seem that both the possession of good sense and piety entitle one to the epithet μακάριοc (cf. also Seeck's translation: "Glücklich, wer verständig und gottesfürchtig ist und sich grossen Gewinn dadurch verschafft"). For the idea of being blessed because of mental qualities one could then compare e.g. Thgn. 1173 ὦ μάκαρ, ὅcτιc δή μιν (sc. γνώμην) ἔχει φρεcίν, E. fr. 910, 1f. ὄλβιοc ὅcτιc τῆc ἱcτορίαc / ἔcχε μάθηcιν, Ar. *Ra.* 1482f. μακάριόc γ' ἀνὴρ ἔχων /ξύνεcιν ἠκριβωμένην (regarded as a parody of fr. 910 by B. Snell, Hermes 66, 1931, 75 n. 4 [= o.c. 85 n. 4]; id., *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen*, Berlin 1971, 97 n. 56; not recorded by Rau), perhaps Men. fr. 101, 1 Koerte (quoted in app. crit.); cf. also Verg. *G.* 2, 490 *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.*

θεὸν: the sg. may indicate 'the god' in general or a special god, referred to in the context. There is no need for Nauck's θεοὺc (see comm. on fr. 252, 3 and Nestle[1] 416 n. 6).

2 κέρδοc: this can be used of concrete gain, but also (as would be required by McDonald's interpretation) of abstractions; cf. e.g. *Med.* 145 τί δέ μοι ζῆν ἔτι κέρδοc; 199, *Andr.* 690 ἐμοὶ δὲ κέρδοc ἡ προμηθία, *El.* 744, fr. 205, 3.

If it is used of concrete profits, our fragment may be compared with other passages where piety is considered necessary for the effectuation of human ends, cf. fr. 1025, 1 f. θεοῦ γὰρ οὐδεὶς χωρὶς εὐτυχεῖ βροτῶν / οὐδ' εἰς τὸ μεῖζον ἦλθε, *Su.* 592 ff., fr. 948; Nestle[1] 52 f. (cf. also X. *Mem.* 2, 1, 28 εἴτε τοὺς θεοὺς ἵλεως εἶναί σοι βούλει, θεραπευτέον τοὺς θεούς).

αὑτῶι: here editors differ in printing either αὑτῶι (so e.g. Schneidewin and Nauck) or αὐτῶι (so e.g. Austin after Bothe); Ranke's αὐτὸ has not been accepted by any of the later editors of the fragment, although it involves only a slight change and could be paralleled from fr. 110, 2 f. πατρὶ πείθεσθαι χρεὼν / παῖδας νομίζειν τ'αὐτὸ τοῦτ' εἶναι δίκην. As in matters of breathings the evidence of the mss. cannot be very much relied upon, we must be led by sense and syntax: the obvious interpretation of the fragment is: "Blessed is he who, having sense, honours the god and regards that as great profit to himself", and in such cases αὑτῶι is the regular way of expressing 'himself'.

Considering that the rich tyrant Kisseus figured in the *Archelaos*, it is perhaps relevant to recall the special faculty of such people to obtain the gods' goodwill by rich offerings; cf. Adkins 242 n. 19 and 134 f., where he compares Bacchylides' version of the story of Kroisos, who was rescued from the pyre by Zeus and Apollo δι' εὐσέβειαν, ὅτι μέ[γιστα] θνατῶν / ἐς ἀγαθέαν ⟨ἀν⟩έπεμψε Π[υθ]ώ (B. 3, 61 f.) and interprets the advice in 83 f. ὅσια δρῶν εὔφραινε θυμόν· τοῦτο γὰρ / κερδέων ὑπέρτατον as "continue to give gifts to Apollo; and you may then have many more years of wealthy life"; similarly, but less materialistic, Maehler ad loc.: "der Anblick seines Weihgeschenks im heiligen Bezirk erfüllt den Stifter mit Stolz und Freude"; but Jebb ad loc., who gives apparently more weight to εὔφραινε θυμόν and the preceding lines on the uncertainty of human life, regards the lines as a deeper kind of *carpe diem*.

ποιεῖται: this could be interpreted either as 'considers' (so F. W. Schmidt 2, 455; cf. e.g. *Hec.* 299 f., *El.* 63, *IA* 607 etc. and for the idea of considering something a profit *Med.* 454 πᾶν κέρδος ἡγοῦ ζημιουμένη φυγῆι) or as 'makes, turns into', the middle being easily explained by the subject's personal involvement which is made explicit by αὑτῶι (so apparently Seeck [cf. his translation quoted above on 1 νοῦν ἔχων]; cf. e.g. *HF* 497 σὺ μὲν τὰ νέρθεν εὐτρεπῆ ποιοῦ, γύναι, *Ba.* 440 [where see Dodds on the middle; more examples in KG 1, 318 f., 1]).

fr. 257 = 31 A

Location of the fragment is uncertain (for some attempts cf. Welcker 2, 706, Hartung 2, 562, Van Herwerden[2] 338, Webster 256, Lowicka 269). If we interpret θυμός as 'anger, temper', as is generally done (except by Welcker,

who appears to take it as 'ambition') and is also suggested by the insertion of the fragment in a chapter ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΓΗϹ, the fragment could be from the same context as frs. 258-259, which also deal with anger and violence. Frequent deprecation of these things would be conceivable e.g. in a scene where one person is inclined to kill another, as in *Hyps.* fr. 22, 3; 60, 5 f., which are spoken by Hypsipyle to the angry Eurydike (perhaps she also spoke fr. 760; cf. Bond ad loc.) or in a scene where someone sees fit to deprecate his own anger, as in Medea's mock-reconciliation in *Med.* 869 ff. or in the scene in the new fragment of the *Antigone* in *POxy.* 47, 3317, 10 ff., which Hughes-Parsons take to be spoken by Antigone: "Do not touch me, your princess (10). I surrender of my own free will (11)" followed by the gnomic lines on anger quoted below on 2 ἥ τ'ἀξυνεϲία (for the attribution of the fr. to the *Antigone*, cf. recently R. Scodel, ZPE 46, 1982, 37-42; otherwise W. Luppe, ZPE 42, 1981, 27-30 [*Antiope*]). Of course these are merely suggestions, which do not exhaust the possibilities.

1 ὁ θυμὸϲ ὁ μέγαϲ: apparently 'anger' (LSJ s.v. II 4): cf. the chapter-heading ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΓΗϹ of Stob. III 20. For the expression cf. e.g. *Il.* 2, 196 θυμὸϲ δὲ μέγαϲ ἐϲτὶ ... βαϲιλήων 9, 496, *Or.* 702 ἔνεϲτι δ' οἶκτοϲ, ἔνι δὲ καὶ θυμὸϲ μέγαϲ. For the idea of destructive anger cf. e.g. *Med.* 1079 f. θυμὸϲ ... / ὅϲπερ μεγίϲτων αἴτιοϲ κακῶν βροτοῖϲ, fr. 31; Thgn. 631 f., 1223 f.; and Chrysosthemis' warning in S. *El.* 1009 ff.

2 ἥ τ' ἀξυνεϲία:'want of understanding, stupidity', perhaps with a moral connotation (so Nestle[1] 189), as often with terms of knowledge or ignorance in Greek and especially at a time when the Socratic idea that 'virtue is knowledge' was in full development (cf. e.g. Adam on Pl. *R.* 382 a 5, Wilamowitz on *HF* 347, Dodds 16 f. [on the Homeric use of οἶδα] and on Pl. *Grg.* 477 b 7, Barrett on *Hipp.* 377-81 [many examples of moral attitudes described in intellectual terms], Guthrie 450 ff. [esp. 450 n. 2], Bond on *HF* 172, 283, 347); in E. cf. e.g. *Ph.* 1726 f. οὐχ ὁρᾶι Δίκα κακούϲ, / οὐδ' ἀμείβεται βροτῶν ἀϲυνεϲίαϲ, 393 τὰϲ τῶν κρατούντων ἀμαθίαϲ φέρειν χρεών, *Andr.* 170 ff. ('lack of finer feeling' Stevens ad loc.), *HF* 172, *Or.* 491 ff. and perhaps fr. 235; cf. also S. F 925 ἡ δὲ μωρία / μάλιϲτ' ἀδελφὴ τῆϲ πονηρίαϲ ἔφυ.

Another possibility is that ἀξυνεϲία, which is here so closely associated with θυμόϲ is the lack of sense which was thought to go with excessive anger; cf. for this widespread notion e.g. E. *Antigone POxy.* 47, 3317, 12 ff. (= fr. trag. adesp. 524 N[2] + fr. 175, but with some textual variants) ἐν τοῖϲ κα]κοῖϲ γὰρ ἡ εὐγένεια ὅτω[ι παρῆι / τραχεῖα κα]ὶ ὀξύθυμοϲ ἀμαθίαν ἔχ[ει· / ὅϲτιϲ δὲ π]ρὸϲ τὸ πῖπτον εὐόργωϲ [φέρει / τὸν δαίμο]να· οὗτοϲ ῥαιον. . . .ωτ[(cf. S. F 589), fr. 760 ἔξω γὰρ ὀργῆϲ πᾶϲ ἀνὴρ ϲοφώτεροϲ, Philemon fr. 184, 185 (2, 529 Kock); Antipho 5, 72; Arist. fr. 661 Rose; Plu. *De cohibenda ira* 2, 453 e ff.). Yet, the fact that the speaker regards ὁ θυμὸϲ ὁ μέγαϲ and ἡ ...

ἀξυνεςία as δύο κακὼ seems to make the first idea of two separate evils, 'excessive anger' and 'stupidity' (possibly with a moral connotation) preferable (cf. also *IT* 487 ff. ὡς δύ' ἐξ ἑνὸς / κακὼ ςυνάπτει, μωρίαν τ' ὀφλιςκάνει / θνήιςκει θ'ὁμοίως, *Ph.* 582 f. δύο κακὼ ςπεύδεις, τέκνον, / κείνων ςτέρεςθαι τῶνδέ τ'ἐν μέςωι πεςεῖν).

τοῖς χρωμένοις: see comm. on fr. 2, 19 A.

fr. 258 = 32 A

Except that the fragment may well be from the same context as frs. 257 and 259, little can be said about its location; see intr. to fr. 257 (and cf. Welcker 2, 708 and the literature quoted on fr. 257).

1 τῶι ... βιαίωι κἀγρίωι τὸ μαλθακὸν: on this type of abstractions see comm. on fr. 232, 4. For a similar contrast cf. *Hyps.* fr. 60, 55 f. (Amphiaraos to the angry Eurydike:) γύναι, τὸ τῆςδε ... κ[α]κὸν / ἀγρίως φέρουςάν ς'ἤπιον θ[έςθαι θέλ]ω.

2 εἰς ταὐτὸν ἐλθὸν: on the expression εἰς ταὐτὸν ἥκειν (ἐλθεῖν) see Barrett on *Hipp.* 273, who gives two meanings: "(a) you are (after a given action) in the same position as you were or would be after another action: here, *El.* 787 ..., *IA* 1002 ..., or (b) you are in the same position as someone else: *Hek.* 748, *Or.* 1280 (both εἰς ταὐτὸν ἥκεις sc. ἐμοί), *IA* 665". To (b) one could add *Hel.* 943, fr. 330, 1. Our fragment, however, is different from both (a) and (b), because here ταὐτὸν is best taken in a 'local' sense: 'when softness gets together with violence and fierceness ...'. This 'meeting' may take place either in the mind of one person (so that the fragment would tell us that a violent person may be tempered by his own softer feelings; if so, εἰς ταὐτὸν ἐλθὸν would here be used in a sense comparable to that of εἰς ἓν ἐλθόντ' in fr. 246, 2 [where see comm.]) or in the coming together of two different persons (in marriage or otherwise), the abstracts indicating what is characteristic of each, so that the idea would be that a violent person may be softened through confrontation with a more gentle nature (in this respect it may be worth noticing that elsewhere in Euripides εἰς ταὐτὸν ἥκειν always has a personal subject, except for fr. 330, 1 f.). For εἰς ταὐτὸν ἥκειν in a local sense cf. e.g. *Ph.* 1404 f. ἔνθεν δὲ κώπας ἁρπάςαντε φαςγάνων / ἐς ταὐτὸν ἧκον (sc. Eteokles and Polyneikes to fight), cf. 585 and also *Hec.* 965 f. μοι / ἐς ταὐτὸν ἧδε ςυμπίτνει δμωὶς ςέθεν.

τοῦ λίαν παρείλετο: for τὸ λίαν as a subst. meaning 'excess' cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 264 f. οὕτω τὸ λίαν ἧςςον ἐπαινῶ / τοῦ μηδὲν ἄγαν and Stevens on *Andr.* 866 (more examples); for παραιρέω + gen. part. 'take away from' (LSJ s.v. I and II 3 [middle]) cf. e.g. *Heracl.* 908 f. τῶν ἀδίκων παραι/ρῶν φρονήματος αἰεί, *Hipp.* 1105 λύπας παραιρεῖ (λύπας regarded as gen. by Barrett ad loc.) and for the whole expression cf. *Hec.* 591 f. τὸ δ'αὖ λίαν παρεῖλες ἀγγελθεῖςά μοι / γενναῖος.

fr. 259 = 33 A

For attempts at location see intr. to fr. 257-258 and the literature quoted here.

ὀργῆι ... φαύληι: without context we cannot recover the exact connotation of φαύληι here. Considering the connection with ἀςχήμονα 'unseemly, shameful' (cf. LSJ s.v. II) I would expect that it means something like 'petty, trivial, ineffective', cf. e.g. *Ph.* 94 κἀμοὶ μὲν ἔλθηι φαῦλος ὡς δούλωι ψόγος.

ἀςχήμονα: apart from here the word is attested in tragedy only in *Hel.* 299 (which is probably an interpolation; cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* {299-302}). The verb ἀςχημονέω is used by Euripides in *Hec.* 405 ff. (said to Hekabe) βούληι ... ἀςχημονῆςαι ... ἐκ νέου βραχίονος / ςπαςθεῖς'.

fr. 260 = 34 A

As to the subject and background of this fragment opinions differ and we know too little about the *Archelaos* to make a firm choice; so I shall merely list a few possibilities and add a few remarks on each of them:

(1) the fragment (in which ἔπαυς' could be either first or third pers. sg.) refers to the exploits of Archelaos; so Welcker 2, 708, Wagner 676, Van Herwerden[2] 317 f. The latter infers from test. 8, 5 ff. ἢ οὐκ αἰπόλος ἦν ὁ Ἀρχέλαος οὐδὲ ἦλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν αἶγας ἐλαύνων; that Archelaos could have come to Macedonia as a goatherd clearing the highways from brigands as he passed, and adduces our fragment in support of it. But, of course, it could only lend support to the idea of clearing the highways, not to the suggestion that he came as a goatherd (in fact, I would have thought it easier to clear highways without the encumbrance of a herd of goats ...; cf. also comm. on test. 8). Even so, Van Herwerden's observation that the fragment — if its subject is Archelaos — must refer to exploits other than the battle against Kisseus' enemies (who could not be described as ὁδουρούς 'highwaymen') must be right;

(2) it refers to some exploits of Herakles, mentioned by the chorus when Archelaos has gone to the battle-field; so Hartung 2, 561, Lowicka 268; cf. Goossens 672 n. 26. Although Hartung's view as to the location of the fragment is mere conjecture, the idea that its subject is Herakles may win some support from the fact that Herakles was sometimes regarded as a protector of travellers. The evidence for it is not overwhelming (cf. Gruppe in *RE* Suppl. 3, 1918, 1015 [s.v. Herakles]), but we may compare the slaying of Kyknos (cf. Gundel in *RE* 11, 1922, 2435 [s.v. Kyknos]). Besides, being one of Archelaos' famous ancestors he may well have been referred to somewhere in the play. On the whole, however, we find Herakles described as conquering mythical monsters rather than human villains threatening travellers, who were more in the line of Theseus (on this difference between both heroes, who

obviously have much in common, see Nilsson[2] 53 ff.) and are undoubtedly meant by ὁδουρούς;

(3) it refers to Theseus; this possibility was suggested by Girard 161 n. 1 (although a parallel with the exploits of Theseus was already observed by Welcker 2, 708), but regarded as less likely by Goossens 672 n. 26. A difficulty might be that it is not so easy to explain why Theseus, who is really the hero of Athens and has little to do with the ancestors of Archelaos, should be mentioned in the *Archelaos*, unless Euripides was led by patriotic reasons, as in *HF*. Even so, we do possess a number of allusions to 'other' myths in the preserved plays of Euripides (they are listed by R. Eisner, Arethusa 12, 1979, 158 f.) and I think that there are good grounds for believing that either Theseus is referred to here or that Archelaos' exploits (on his way to Macedonia?) are described in a way which makes him strongly reminiscent of Theseus: (a) the well-known story of how young Theseus on his way to Athens did away with all sorts of villains who were a danger to travellers (cf. e.g. B. 18, 18 ff. and *Hipp.* 976 ff.) is described in the mythographers in terms which recall what is said in our fragment (and its context in Σ Pi. *P.* 2, 57); cf. e.g. Apollod. 3, 16, 1 Θησεὺς ... πεζὸς ἠπείγετο εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. φρουρουμένην δὲ ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν κακούργων τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμέρωσε (cf. S. F 905), Paus. 2, 1, 4 ἐκάθηρε γὰρ Θησεὺς τῶν κακούργων τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἐς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Τροιζῆνος, (b) moreover our fragment is reminiscent of two fragments of Sophocles, which undoubtedly refer to Theseus: F 22 (quoted in app. crit.) and F 730 c, 16 ff. (Theseus on his exploits on his way to Athens) and especially 19 ff. σὺν̣ ἐμπόρω[ν] δηλήμον' ἦν [/ ἔπαυσα δειν[ ].ς κἀνυ-ποστάτ̣[/ ἔπαυ]σ̣α δὲ Σκ[είρ]ωνα τὸν θα[, (c) there is a striking general resemblance between Archelaos as he appears from the fragments and testimonia of the *Archelaos* and the type of young Theseus, starting on his career by this journey to Athens (cf. H. Herter, *RE* Suppl. 13, 1973, 1061 ff. [s.v. Theseus] and Carden 120 f. on this journey): journey, youth (Theseus is described as παῖδα ... / πρώθηβον in B. 18, 56 f.; cf. further Herter o.c. 1064 f.), arrival in another city, helping the local king; on Theseus applying himself to πόνος and ἀρετή see Herter o.c. 1218 f.

Another suggestion which has sometimes been made about this fragment is that it may contain an allusion to the activities of the historical Archelaos as described in Th. 2, 100, 2 Ἀρχέλαος ... τὰ νῦν ὄντα ἐν τῆι χώραι ᾠκοδόμησε καὶ ὁδοὺς εὐθείας ἔτεμε καὶ τἆλλα διεκόσμησε τά [τε] κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἵπποις καὶ ὅπλοις καὶ τῆι ἄλληι παρασκευῆι κρείσσονι ἢ ξύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι βασιλῆς ὀκτὼ οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενόμενοι; cf. Welcker 3, 1595, Girard 160 f., Goossens 665. But the measures taken by Archelaos in Th. 2, 100, 2 are primarily of a military nature (cf. Hammond-Griffith 140), and although it cannot be denied that they may have put an end to robbery as well and that Euripides may have given it all a poetical twist, I find the evidence too scanty

for firm conclusions (especially as we do not know who was the subject of ἔπαυϲ').

ἔπαυϲ': whether this stands for ἔπαυϲα or ἔπαυϲε cannot be decided. If the fragment is complete in itself, παύω is here used with acc. of persons only, though some verb was perhaps to be mentally supplied from the context; cf. e.g. S. *Ant.* 963f. παύεϲκε μὲν γὰρ ἐνθέουϲ / γυναῖκαϲ εὔιόν τε πῦρ, *OT* 396f.; E. *Alc.* 1087 (but see Dale ad loc.) and LSJ s.v. παύω I 1. Alternatively the acc. may have gone with a gen., part. or inf. which was not quoted by Σ (cf. LSJ s.v. παύω I 2-4).

ὁδουροὺϲ: this word is, as far as I can see, apart from our fragment only attested in S. F 22 (quoted in app. crit.) and E. *Ion* 1616f. (Athena:) ϲτείχεθ', ἕψομαι δ'ἐγώ. / (Kreousa or Ion:) ἀξία γ' ἡμῶν ὁδουρόϲ and in the lexicographers (cf. Phot. s.v. ὁδουρίϲ, ὁδουρεῖϲ, ὁδουρούϲ, ὁδωρεῖν [1, 316, 10ff. Porson]; Hsch. s.v. ὁδουρούϲ, ὁδούρηϲ, ὁδουρόϲ [O 99-101 Latte]). Being connected with οὖροϲ 'watcher' (cf. such compounds as πυλωρόϲ, θυρωρόϲ, φρουρόϲ etc.) it suggests people who 'watch the road', i.e. on the one hand robbers, who lay in ambush watching out for innocent travellers to attack (as in our fragment and S. F 22), on the other hand someone who watches the road in order to protect travellers from its dangers, which must be the meaning of ὁδουρόϲ in *Ion* 1617 ('itineris custos' Van Herwerden ad loc., which nicely hits the mark).

λυμεῶναϲ: poetic word, often constructed with a gen. obj.; in E. only here and in *Hipp.* 1068 γυναικῶν λυμεῶναϲ. If one wants a gen. obj. here, Radt's ἐμπόρων would suit the context (cf. S. F 730 c, 19 [quoted above]).

fr. 261 = 35 A

Discussions of this fragment focus on the identity of the δούλη: Welcker 2, 707 and Van Herwerden[2] 337 took her to be the daughter of Kisseus: Archelaos in conversation with Kisseus, who refuses to give him his daughter in marriage after all, supports his claim by stating that without his help she would have become a slave to the enemy. But their interpretation seems hard to maintain for several reasons: (1) it ignores the attribution of the fragment to the chorus in *S* (but see below), (2) ἔϲωϲα δούλην οὖϲαν must refer to the rescuing of somebody who actually *was* a slave (or in a slave-like position) when she was rescued, not of somebody who might have become a slave if she had not been rescued, (3) the explanation in οἱ γὰρ — βροτῶν suggests that the object of the rescue was not δούλη in a literal sense, but is here called so because, being weak, she was subjected to the power of stronger people (for details see comm.). If the observation made under (3) is right, the fragment could still refer to the daughter of Kisseus, but the idea would then be that she had been a 'slave', because subjected to her father's will (he being

κρείccων) and now freed from his tyranny by the speaker of this fragment, or we could follow Lowicka 270 + n. 17, who let the fragment refer to the rescuing of the town (δούλην οὖcαν sc. πόλιν, describing its relation to Kisseus or to the enemies). Both these interpretations would account for the explanatory clause, but a difficulty is that it is hard to see how such words could be spoken by the chorus. To get things straight one would either have to regard the attribution of the lines to the chorus in *S* as wrong or to adopt e.g. Meineke's ἔcωcε. But it is perhaps safer to say that no attempt at interpretation, so far, has hit the mark (for a few more attempts see Hartung 2, 563, F. W. Schmidt 2, 456).

1 δούλην οὖcαν: the part. construction probably stood in apposition with the object of ἔcωcα (you/her/some fem. subst.), which must have been contained by the preceding line(s). If the object were a woman, the daughter of Kisseus springs to mind; δούλην οὖcαν would indicate that she was in a slave-like position; for this use of δοῦλοc etc. cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 424 f. δουλοῖ γὰρ ἄνδρα ... / ὅταν ξυνειδῆι μητρὸc ἢ πατρὸc κακά, fr. 282, 5, 502, 3 f., 545, 1; perhaps it is also relevant to compare A. *Ch.* 135 and E. *El.* 1004, where Elektra compares herself to a δούλη. If, on the other hand, the object were a subst., πόλιc (which was suggested by Lowicka 270 n. 17) may be a suitable candidate: for πόλιc as a slave cf. e.g. S. *Tr.* 283 πόλιc δὲ δούλη, *OC* 917 f., A. *Th.* 254, E. *Su.* 492 f.; for cῴζω in relation to a town cf. e.g. A. *Th.* 749 cῴζειν πόλιν, S. *Ant.* 1058 ἐξ ἐμοῦ γὰρ τήνδ' ἔχειc cώcαc πόλιν, E. *Ph.* 560 πότερα τυραννεῖν ἢ πόλιν cῶcαι θέλειc, 864, 997, *Su.* 244, fr. 360, 42 and 52 (some examples from prose-texts in LSJ s.v. cῴζω I 2). If so, the lines could refer either to the defeat of the enemies, or — less likely perhaps — to the killing of Kisseus.

οἱ γὰρ — βροτῶν: Gomperz 1, 115 rightly observed "dass der begründende Satz οἱ γὰρ ἥccονεc — βροτῶν ein Kennzeichen oder Merkmal der δουλεία enthält". It must therefore explain why the speaker speaks about the object of ἔcωcα as δούλην οὖcαν, not why he rescued her. Cf. on this use of γάρ, referring "not to the main idea of the preceding sentence, but ... (II) to an individual word or phrase" Denniston 65 f. (examples on 66). So e.g. A. *Ag.* 1225 f. (Kassandra:) τῶι μολόντι δεcπότηι / ἐμῶι· φέρειν γὰρ χρὴ τὸ δούλιον ζυγόν, i.e. 'I call him δεcπότηc, because...' (but for doubts on the authenticity of 1226 see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1224-6; less sweeping Denniston-Page ad loc.). We could therefore paraphrase: 'I rescued her (?), being a slave, [and I am calling her a slave] because the weak are usually slaves to the stronger...' and infer that 'she' was not really a slave, but merely in a slave-like position. Such a description might fit the daughter of Kisseus or the town (in which case there would be a shift from the town to its citizens in οἱ γὰρ ἥccονεc).

2 φιλοῦcι: best taken in the sense 'to be used to' (LSJ s.v. II 1), and not

with Nestle[1] 293 and Mette[5] 86 (F 305) in the sense 'to love to' ("diene doch der Schwächere dem Stärkeren gern" Mette), because (1) there seems to be no point in rescuing somebody who actually likes the position he is in, (2) the idea that the weak are subject to the strong (whether they 'like' it or not) is quite commonplace; cf. e.g. *Su.* 492 f. τὸν ἥccονα / δουλούμεθ', ἄνδρες ἄνδρα καὶ πόλις πόλιν, fr. 286, 10-12, 1107, Philemon fr. 31, 5 ff. (2, 486 Kock); in prose e.g. Th. 5, 89 (the Athenians to the Melians:) δυνατὰ δὲ οἱ προύχοντες πράccουcι καὶ οἱ ἀcθενεῖc ξυγχωροῦcιν and Kallikles' *Herrenmoral* in Plato's *Gorgias* (e.g. Pl. *Grg.* 483 d 5 f. ὅτι οὕτω τὸ δίκαιον κέκριται, τὸν κρείττω τοῦ ἥττονος ἄρχειν καὶ πλέον ἔχειν).

fr. 262 = 36 A

This fragment has been generally — and quite plausibly — regarded as a reflection of the chorus towards the end of the play (so e.g. Welcker 2, 709, Hartung 2, 564, Van Herwerden[2] 339, Lowicka 270); for similar reflections in similar positions cf. *Heracl.* 863 ff. (the servant reflecting on the uncertainty of human happiness, which has just been 'proved' by the fate of Eurystheus, now captured by Iolaos), S. *Ant.* 1156 ff. (messenger on the disasters which have befallen the once enviable Kreon). Considering these passages I think it is quite conceivable that our fragment is from a reflection on the fate of Kisseus, fallen from his former prosperity into the pit. The speaker may be the chorus, but could also be another character in the play. Even so, it should be noted that other contexts are conceivable too; cf. e.g. *Hec.* 282 ff., *Su.* 269 f. (argument to make those who have power do the right thing; although, if εὖ is sound — as I think it is —, our fragment is probably not from such an argument, because the addition would seem rather tactless), *HF* 103 (Amphitryon comforting Megara; our fr. is regarded as comforting by J. Kvíčala, České Mus. Fil. 7, 1901, 420 ff.).

The idea of the instability of the human fate was of course commonplace; cf. e.g. Hdt. 1, 5, 4; Epicharmus 23 B 2, 6 ff. (1, 196, 6 ff. DK); Theodektes *TrGF* 1, 72 F 16; Diphilus fr. 45 (2, 556 Kock); S. *Aj.* 131 f.; E. fr. 196, 273, 330, 420, 1073 and the passages quoted above; further Stob. IV 41 passim; Collard on *Su.* 269b-70 (some more references). See in general J. Krause, *ΑΛΛΟΤΕ ΑΛΛΟϹ. Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schicksalswechsels* ..., München 1976 (on fr. 262 see p. 281).

1 πάλαι: not necessarily to be taken as an indication that the speaker was old, although it does suggest some experience of life; cf. Krause o.c. 281. Van Herwerden[2] 340 infers from πάλαι that the chorus, which is regarded by him as the speaker of the fragment, consisted of old men; see intr. 2.2.

τὰc τύχαc †τῶν† βροτῶν: the problem to be solved here is twofold: (a) the line as it stands is metrically defective (τὰc τύχαc τὰc τῶν βροτῶν in *cod.*

Paris. 1985 I regard as an attempt at correction rather than as a serious variant; cf. on this ms. Wachsmuth Stob. 1 p. xxx; Hense Stob. 3 p. xxv), (b) τῶν βροτῶν is unlikely to be right because βροτοί never goes with an article in tragedy, unless an adjective or pronoun is added (cf. LSJ s.v.). Scholars have tried to find a way out of these difficulties (1) by replacing τῶν by something else: so Nauck's ἐγώ, which has the advantage of being palaeographically simple, and Papageorgios' πάντων. But πάντων seems a little pointless here; cf. for contrast such passages as *Alc.* 782 βροτοῖϲ ἅπαϲι κατθανεῖν ὀφείλεται, *Andr.* 422, fr. 452, 1, (2) by replacing τῶν βροτῶν by something else: so Hense τὰϲ ἐφημέρων τύχαϲ and Busche τὰϲ βροτηϲίαϲ τύχαϲ. But here a difficulty is that it is hard to see how either of these could have got ousted by τῶν βροτῶν, which, for one thing, is unlikely to have crept in as a marginal gloss, βροτοί being a poetical word, which may want glossing itself (cf. Hsch. β 1204 Latte βροτόϲ· φθαρτόϲ, ἢ γηγενὴϲ ἄνθρωποϲ; Ap. Soph. 52, 33; Σ D *Il.* 1, 272). ἐφημέρων would almost certainly have been glossed by ἀνθρώπων; cf. Σ *Or.* 976 [1, 193, 7 Schwartz] ὦ πολύπονα ἔθνη τῶν ἀνθρώπων to explain *Or.* 976 f. ἰὼ ἰώ, πανδάκρυτ' ἐφαμέρων / ἔθνη πολύπονα, Hsch. ε 7448, 7449 Latte. βροτήϲιοϲ is glossed in Hsch. β 1196 Latte βροτήϲια· ἀνθρώπεια καὶ ἀνθρώπινα (where Latte compares *Andr.* 1255); we may also compare Σ *OT* 709 βρότειον· τὸ ἀνθρώπινον and the paraphrase in Σ Pi. *P.* 5, 1 b τιϲ ἀνθρώπων for βροτήϲιοϲ ἀνὴρ (*P.* 5, 3). Even so, it is perhaps not inconceivable that someone replaced βροτηϲίαϲ by τῶν βροτῶν: since the adj. is much less familiar than the noun, the noun may have been used to explain it. For the adj. cf. *Andr.* 1255 κακῶν ἀπαλλάξαϲα τῶν βροτηϲίων, *Or.* 271, *Ba.* 4, *IA* 1524.

2 ὡϲ εὖ μεταλλάϲϲουϲιν: μεταλλάϲϲουϲιν is here used intr.: 'undergo a change, change' (LSJ s.v. III); cf. e.g. Epicharmus 23 B 2, 9 (1, 196, 9 DK) ὃ δὲ μεταλλάϲϲει κατὰ φύϲιν κοὔποκ' ἐν ταὐτῶι μένει in a context very similar to our fragment (an explanation of the variant μεταβάλλουϲιν may be that this verb often occurs in similar contexts, cf. e.g. *HF* 480, 884, *Ion* 1512, *Tr.* 1118 [also intr.] etc.).

εὖ: this has often been suspected (Nestle[1] 499 n. 4 called it "höchst sonderbar") and emendations have been proposed. The difficulty seems to be that it is hard to see what is meant by 'they change well'. But there may be a way out of this if we take εὖ to imply that the changeability of the τύχαι is actually approved of, a notion which at first sight seems surprising, but may have fitted the context of the *Archelaos.* We must take into consideration that at the end of the play the exile Archelaos was promised the foundation of his own city Aigai and that his future probably seemed bright again, whereas the former king Kisseus was now dead. The general tone of the play was in all probability such as to make the audience regard this as a change for the better. In such a play the changeability of fortune may well have been looked

upon as a good thing. If so, εὖ μεταλλάccουcιν should be paraphrased not by ‘they change well’, but by something like ‘it is a good thing that they do change’; for this use of εὖ cf. e.g. *IT* 532 f. ὄλωλεν (sc. Kalchas) ... / (Iph.:) ὦ πότνι’, ὡc εὖ, not qualifying the way in which Kalchas died, but approving of his death; similarly with κακῶc *Hec.* 326, *Su.* 298, *Ph.* 379, 381; cf. also ὀρθῶc in fr. 264, 1. εὖ was also defended by Kvíčala o.c. 420 ff. (see intr. to this fr.).

2 f. On the antithetical expression cf. Krause o.c. 281 n. 3.

3 εἰc ὀρθὸν ἔcτη: for this expression cf. e.g. *Su.* 1229 f. μόνον cύ με / ἐc ὀρθὸν ἵcτη (where see Collard), S. *OT* 50 cτάντεc τ’ἐc ὀρθὸν καὶ πεcόντεc ὕcτερον and Pearson on S. fr. 612.

εὐτυχῶν: ‘he who had a good τύχη’; the word may well have been chosen deliberately in view of τύχαc in 1; on use and meaning of εὐτυχήc etc. in Euripides cf. McDonald 153 ff., 294 ff., 300 f.

πίτνει: of course used metaphorically (cf. also S. *OT* 50 quoted above), but if the fragment was spoken after—or shortly before—Kisseus’ fall into the pit, there may be a touch of tragic irony.

fr. 263 = 37 A

As to the interpretation and location of this fragment opinions differ (cf. Welcker 2, 706, Hartung 2, 562, Van Herwerden[2] 340, Webster 257, Lowicka 270). It is important for the interpretation that the ὅταν-clause seems to define the ἡδύ. This point was missed by Welcker, who took the fragment to be a reaction of the chorus after the messenger-speech about the battle: in spite of its sadness about those who were killed, the chorus is happy about the victory. But it is implicit in Van Herwerden’s idea that φίλον in 3 is stressed: the chorus, according to Van Herwerden, means that with Kisseus, who was a villain, there is no such comfort; cf. also Mette[5] 89 (F 319) “Chor sieht in der Klage um einen ἀνὴρ φίλοc (Tod des Kisseus?) ein ἡδύ”. F. W. Schmidt 2, 456 thought along the same lines, but wanted to emphasize ἐν οἴκωι, thus contrasting the situation with one in which the dead were far away (for details see comm. on 2 f.). Although I do not see how exactly this could fit in in the *Archelaos*, it is quite conceivable that it did occur somewhere in the play, which after all dealt partly with war and battle. Webster’s (and Lowicka’s) idea that the fragment is from a lament sung by the daughter of Kisseus after his death is far less likely: first of all we have no evidence at all that the daughter was a character in the play (cf. intr. 2.2), secondly the fragment does not sound like a lament.

Metre: – ⏑⟨⏑⟩ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ | 3 da |
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ | 3 da |
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – | 4 $da_{\wedge}$ |

If one inserts ⟨τι⟩ in 1 with Meineke, the metre is straightforwardly dactylic, with a 'spondaic' clausula (?) in 3 (τι may have dropped out easily after εcτι; besides, τι ... ἡδύ, not merely ἡδύ, is demanded by the sense). I have kept Nauck's colometry, but as the colometry of dactylic passages may be uncertain even in the preserved plays (cf. Dale 31), we cannot be certain that this division is right (cf. also Nauck). On lyric dactyls in general cf. Dale 25-46. Considering that – – is preceded by a long series of pure dactyls I have described 3 as 4 $da_{\wedge}$.

1 καὶ παρὰ δάκρυcι: 'even beside tears', i.e. the idea expressed here seems to be not that there may be comfort *in* tears (which of course is quite common in Greek literature; cf. in E. e.g. *Andr.* 91 ff. [and Stevens on 94], *El.* 126 [and Denniston ad loc.], *Tr.* 608 f., fr. 573), but rather that even when there is cause to cry there can still be something ἡδύ for people in certain circumstances (ὅταν — οἴκωι), because (1) this accounts better for the use of παρά (cf. e.g. *IA* 1488 ff. οὐ δάκρυά γε coι / δώcομεν ἁμέτερα· / παρ' ἱεροῖc γὰρ οὐ πρέπει and Pl. *Phileb.* 41 d) and (2) the idea that there is comfort *in* tears is not valid only under certain conditions, but is generally applicable. What is expressed in our fragment seems to be that even if one is very sad, there is some comfort, ὅταν — ἐν οἴκωι.

1 f. ἔcτι ... / κείμενον: this is an unusual expression; one may compare fr. 916, 4 f. κοὐκ ἔcτιν ὅροc κείμενοc οὐδεὶc / εἰc ὄντινα χρὴ κέλcαι θνητοῖc, but of course ὅρον τιθέναι is a common expression. Cf. on this type of periphrasis in general KG 1, 38 Anm. 3. F. W. Schmidt's idea that κείμενον here = θανόντα and must be placed after οἴκωι seems difficult to maintain for metrical reasons: although in itself κεῖμαι can be very well used of the dead and one could aptly compare *Or.* 1357 f. τὸν Ἑλέναc φόνον / καθαιμακτὸν ἐν δόμοιc κείμενον for ἐν οἴκωι κείμενον, I should be reluctant to give up the 'spondaic' οἴκωι at the end (on 'spondaic' period-end in lyric dactyls cf. Dale 26).

2 f. ὅταν / ἄνδρα φίλον cτενάχηι τιc ἐν οἴκωι: this subordinate clause seems to give the condition under which there may be some comfort for those who are crying. As to the exact nature of the comfort there are two possibilities: (1) Van Herwerden[2] 340: emphasis on φίλον. But Van Herwerden himself was not very happy with this solution, and I think rightly, because it would really demand something like ἐcθλὸν instead of φίλον so as to make the ἄνδρα the opposite of the evil Kisseus (cf. intr. to this fragment); Mette[5] 89 (F 319) also seems to regard ἄνδρα φίλον as being emphasized, but without further arguments. One could perhaps argue that when bewailing a 'beloved man' there would be some comfort in looking back on a beautiful relationship (somewhat like Sapph. fr. 94 L-P, where Sappho is comforting herself with sweet memories), but to infer all this from a simple ἄνδρα φίλον, which need not mean anything more than that the man was a close relative,

seems to strain the evidence (even so, the idea cannot be excluded altogether, because it may have been further developed in the context), (2) F. W. Schmidt 2, 456: emphasis on ἐν οἴκωι: "auch neben Thränen macht sich bei den Sterblichen ein Gefühl der Befriedigung, die das Herz wohlthuend berührt, geltend, sobald man einen lieben Freund, der im Hause gestorben ist, zu beklagen hat". This seems an attractive idea: if someone died far away from home and was buried in foreign soil (or, even worse, not buried at all) this used to be a cause of great distress, both for him who was dying and for the relatives at home. Cf. Griffin 106 ff., who discusses a number of passages which bring out "the bitterness of death far away from home, which is worse than death itself" (108), most of them from the viewpoint of the dying hero; the emotions of the bereaved relatives are illustrated by Hekabe's appeal to Hektor in *Il.* 22, 86 ff. εἴ περ γάρ cε κατακτάνηι, οὔ c' ἔτ' ἔγωγε / κλαύcομαι ἐν λεχέεcci, φίλον θάλοc, ὃν τέκον αὐτή, / οὐδ' ἄλοχοc πολύδωροc· ἄνευθε δέ cε μέγα νῶϊν / Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυcὶ κύνεc ταχέεc κατέδονται (and the efforts made in *Il.* 24 to get him home for proper laments and burning) and Elektra's regrets in S. *El.* 1136 ff. νῦν δ'ἐκτὸc οἴκων κἀπὶ γῆc ἄλληc φυγὰc / κακῶc ἀπώλου, cῆc καcιγνήτηc δίχα· / κοὔτ' ἐν φίλαιcι χερcὶν ἡ τάλαιν' ἐγὼ / λουτροῖc c' ἐκόcμηc' etc. (cf. for similar sentiments also A. *Ch.* 8 f., E. *IT* 172 ff.; *Tr.* 376 ff. [where see Lee]).

Considering all this I think it is quite conceivable that it is here regarded as ⟨τι⟩ ... ἡδὺ when one is able to bewail the corpse of a dear one *at home*: Schmidt's view seems preferable to the other suggestions.

cτενάχηι: this verb is used by Euripides only in lyrics (cf. *Tr.* 106, *Ph.* 1551), whereas cτένω and cτενάζω are also attested in dialogue. Cf. Breitenbach 45.

fr. 264 = 38 A

This fragment has been generally taken to be spoken by the chorus near the end of the play and to be alluding to the punishment of Kisseus (Welcker 2, 709 etc.). The metre (anapaests) also is in favour of this idea, as it could well be used in the chorus' final words just before their departure (the second [catalectic] tetrameter could then be the last line of the play). If so, it is rather surprising to see how well the lines fit the contents of the play (if one takes them to allude to the pitfall, which was οὐκ ὀρθῶc constructed by Kisseus and ὀρθῶc led to his own death), because that is quite unusual in the tail-pieces of the preserved plays of Euripides (cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1688-92; very suspicious as to their authenticity Barrett on *Hipp.* 1462-6). But one may perhaps compare the appropriate final words in S. *El.* 1508-10, *Ant.* 1348-53. The possibility that Euripides, too, could add an appropriate tail-piece if he wanted to, cannot be *a priori* excluded.

1 f. πραccόμεν' ... / ... πράccουcιν: for the play with two forms of the same verb see comm. on fr. 255, 3.

ὀρθῶc: West 71 f. suspects this word, remarking: "while nothing is commoner than the assertion that the wicked are always punished ..., I know no passage where an evaluative comment such as ὀρθῶc or δικαίωc is added". Even so, the sentiment would fit in with fr. 262 (where see comm.), and I should be reluctant to give up the contrast in οὐκ ὀρθῶc ... ὀρθῶc.

2 κακὸν ἦλθεν: the aor. may be either gnomic or refer to what had just happened in the play. This of course depends on the contents of the preceding lines, which are here explained by the γάρ-clause.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

FRAGMENTS AND TESTIMONIA ATTRIBUTED TO THE *KRESPHONTES*

A. Papyrus-fragment

E. fr. inc. 953 (*PDidot*, ed. princeps H. Weil, *Un papyrus inédit de la Bibliothèque de M. Ambroise Firmin-Didot*, Paris 1879).

ὦ πάτερ, ἐχρῆν μὲν οὓς ἐγὼ λόγους λέγω,
τούτους λέγειν cε· καὶ γὰρ ἁρμόζει φρονεῖν
cὲ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐμὲ καὶ λέγειν ὅπου τι δεῖ·
ἐπεὶ δ'ἀφῆκας, λοιπόν ἐcτ'ἴcωc ἐμὲ
ἐκ τῆc ἀνάγκηc τά γε δίκαι'αὐτὴν λέγειν.
ἐκεῖνοc εἰ μὲν μεῖζον ἠδίκηκέ τι,
οὐκ ἐμὲ προcήκει λαμβάνειν τούτων δίκην·
ἃ δ' εἰc ἔμ' ἡμάρτηκεν αἰcθέcθαι με δεῖ.
ἀλλ' ἀγνοῶ δὴ τυχὸν ἴcωc ἄφρων ἐγὼ
οὖc', οὐκ ἂν ἀντείποιμι· καίτοι γ', ὦ πάτερ,
εἰ τἄλλα κρίνειν ἐcτὶν ἀνόητον γυνή,
περὶ τῶν γ' ἑαυτῆc πραγμάτων ἴcωc φρονεῖ ....
ἔcτω δ'ὃ βούλει· τοῦτο τί μ' ἀδικεῖ, λέγε.
ἔcτ' ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ κείμενοc νόμοc,
τῶι μὲν διὰ τέλουc ἣν ἔχει cτέργειν ἀεί,
τῆι δ'ὅc' ἂν ἀρέcκηι τἀνδρὶ ταῦτ' αὐτὴν ποιεῖν.
γέγονεν ἐκεῖνοc εἰc ἔμ' οἷον ἠξίουν,
ἐμοί τ'ἀρέcκει πάνθ' ἃ κἀκείνωι, πάτερ.
ἀλλ' ἔcτ' ἐμοὶ μὲν χρηcτόc, ἠπόρηκε δέ.
cὺ δ' ἀνδρί μ', ὡc φῄc, ἐκδίδωc νῦν πλουcίωι,
ἵνα μὴ καταζῶ τὸν βίον λυπουμένη.
καὶ ποῦ τοcαῦτα χρήματ' ἐcτίν, ὦ πάτερ,
ἃ μᾶλλον ἀνδρὸc εὐφρανεῖ παρόντα με;
ἢ πῶc δίκαιόν ἐcτιν ἢ καλῶc ἔχον
τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν με τὸ μέροc ὧν εἶχεν λαβεῖν,
τοῦ cυναπορηθῆναι δὲ μὴ λαβεῖν μέροc;
φέρ' ἢν ὁ νῦν ⟨δὴ⟩ λαμβάνειν μέλλων μ' ἀνήρ,
ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, Ζεῦ φίλ', οὐδ' ἔcται ποτέ,
οὐκ οὖν θελούcηc οὐδὲ δυναμένηc ἐμοῦ,
ἢν οὗτοc αὖθιc ἀποβάληι τὴν οὐcίαν,
ἑτέρωι με δώcειc ἀνδρί; κᾆιτ' ἐὰν πάλιν

ἐκεῖνοϲ, ἑτέρωι; μέχρι πόϲου τὴν τῆϲ τύχηϲ,
πάτερ, ϲὺ λήψηι πεῖραν ἐν τὠμῶι βίωι;
ὅτ᾽ ἦν ἐγὼ παῖϲ, τότε ϲε χρῆν ζητεῖν ἐμοὶ
ἄνδρ᾽ ὧι με δώϲειϲ· ϲὴ γὰρ ἦν τόθ᾽ αἵρεϲιϲ·
ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἅπαξ δέδωκαϲ, ἤδη ἐϲτίν, πάτερ,
ἐμὸν ϲκοπεῖν τοῦτ᾽, εἰκότωϲ· μὴ γὰρ καλῶϲ
κρίναϲ᾽ ἐμαυτῆϲ τὸν ἴδιον βλάψω βίον.
ταῦτ᾽ ἔϲτιν· ὥϲτε μή με, πρὸϲ τῆϲ ἑϲτίαϲ,
ἀποϲτερήϲηιϲ ἀνδρὸϲ ὧι ϲυνώικιϲαϲ·
χάριν δικαίαν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, πάτερ,
αἰτῶ ϲε ταύτην. εἰ δὲ μή, ϲὺ μὲν βίαι
πράξειϲ ἃ βούλει· τὴν δ᾽ ἐμὴν ἐγὼ τύχην
πειράϲομ᾽ ὡϲ δεῖ μὴ μετ᾽ αἰϲχύνηϲ φέρειν

This fragment was said to be from the *Kresphontes* by Th. Bergk, RhM 35, 1880, 244ff. and Calderini passim. But it is now generally believed that the speech is not from Euripides; see intr. 1.4.

B. Book-fragments

1 E. *Erectheus* fr. 362, 18-20 (= 53, 18-20 A)

φίλουϲ δὲ τοὺϲ μὲν μὴ χαλῶνταϲ ἐν λόγοιϲ
κέκτηϲο· τοὺϲ δὲ πρὸϲ χάριν ϲὺν ἡδονῆι
τῆι ϲῆι †πονηροὺϲ† κλῆιθρον εἰργέτω ϲτέγηϲ

These lines were attributed to Merope by Plu. *Quomodo adulat. ab amico internosc.* 22, 63 a (ἡ μὲν τραγικὴ Μερόπη παραινεῖ '...') and therefore treated by Hartung 2, 52 as if they belonged to the *Kresphontes*. Wagner 707 remarked that there was either a mistake in Plutarch, or that the lines really belonged both in the *Erectheus* and the *Kresphontes*. The first view was taken over by Nauck, Austin 29, Musso^{6} Appendix 1 (p. 44), and Mette^{5} 159 (F [611]). Cengarle 74 defends the second view, but the parallels he offers are all of *single* lines that occur twice (cf. also Cengarle 72). On repetition of lines in Euripides see further Ph. W. Harsh, *Repetition of lines in Euripides*, Hermes 72, 1937, 435-449.

2 E. *Polyidos* fr. 645

ϲυγγνώμοναϲ τοι τοὺϲ θεοὺϲ εἶναι δόκει,
ὅταν τιϲ ὅρκωι θάνατον ἐκφυγεῖν θέληι
ἢ δεϲμὸν ἢ βίαια πολεμίων κακά,
ἢ παιϲὶν αὐθένταιϲι κοινωνῆι δόμων.
ἦ τἄρα θνητῶν εἰϲιν ἀϲυνετώτεροι
ἢ τἀπιεικῆ πρόϲθεν ἡγοῦνται δίκηϲ

Attributed to the *Kresphontes* by Hartung 2, 50 (who gives no arguments for the attribution).

3 E. fr. inc. 908 + F 908 a Snell and F *908 b Snell

fr. inc. 908

τὸ μὴ γενέcθαι κρεῖccον ἢ φῦναι βροτοῖc.
ἔπειτα παῖδαc cὺν πικραῖc ἀλγηδόcιν
τίκτω; τεκοῦcα δ'ἢν μὲν ἄφρονας τέκω,
cτένω ματαίωc, εἰcορῶcα ⟨μὲν⟩ κακούc,
χρηcτοὺc δ'ἀπολλῦc'· ἢν δὲ καὶ cεcωcμένουc,
τήκω τάλαιναν καρδίαν ὀρρωδίαι;
τί τοῦτο δὴ τὸ χρηcτόν; οὐκ ἀρκεῖ μίαν
ψυχὴν ἀλύειν κἀπὶ τῆιδ' ἔχειν πόνουc;

F 908 a Snell

× – ἔμοιγε νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι δοκεῖ
παῖδαc φυτεύειν οὔποτ' ἀνθρώπουc ἐχρῆν
πόνουc ὁρῶνταc εἰc ὅcουc φυτεύομεν

F *908 b Snell

ὡc δυcτυχεῖν φὺc καὶ κακῶc πεπραγέναι,
ἄνθρωποc ἐγένου καὶ τὸ δυcτυχὲc βίου
ἐκεῖθεν ἔλαβεc, ὅθεν ἅπαcιν ἤρξατο
τρέφειν ὅδ' αἰθὴρ ἐνδιδοὺc θνητοῖc πνοάc·
μή νυν τὰ θνητὰ θνητὸc ὢν ἀγνωμόνει

These fragments were attributed to the *Kresphontes* by Welcker 2, 832 f., who connected them with fr. 449, which he regarded as the end of a long speech on the futility of life, written out by Clem. Al. *Strom.* 3, 22 (i.e. the source of these fragments). See further intr. to *PFayum* + fr. 449 = 67 A.

4 E. fr. inc. 1058

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔξω λέκτρα αὐτοῖc καλῶc ἔχειν
δίκαιόν ἐcτιν οἷcι cυγγηράcομαι

This was attributed to the *Kresphontes* by Wecklein 14, who accepted Valckenaer's version of the fragment (cf. Nauck's apparatus) and located it in the reconciliation-scene (Merope speaking 1, Polyphontes 2). He also pointed to the traging irony in οἷcι cυγγηράcομαι. But all this is purely hypothetical, especially because the text is far from certain (cf. also Musso[6] Appendix 1 [p. 44]).

5 E. fr. inc. 1083

Περὶ δὲ τῆc φύcεωc τῶν τόπων καὶ τούτων καὶ τῶν Μεccηνιακῶν ταῦτα μὲν ἀποδεκτέον, λέγοντοc Εὐριπίδου· τὴν γὰρ Λακωνικὴν φηcιν ἔχειν

'πολὺν μὲν ἄροτον, ἐκπονεῖν δ' οὐ ῥάιδιον·
κοίλη γάρ, ὄρεcι περίδρομοc, τραχεῖά τε
δυcείcβολόc τε πολεμίοιc'

τὴν δὲ Μεccηνιακὴν

'καλλίκαρπον
κατάρρυτόν τε μυρίοιcι νάμαcι,
καὶ βουcὶ καὶ ποίμναιcιν εὐβοτωτάτην,
οὔτ' ἐν πνοαῖcι χείματοc δυcχείμερον
οὔτ' αὖ τεθρίπποιc ἡλίου θερμὴν ἄγαν'·

καὶ ὑποβὰc τῶν πάλων φηcίν, ὧν οἱ Ἡρακλεῖδαι περὶ τῆc χώραc ἐποιήcαντο, τὸν μὲν πρότερον γενέcθαι

'γαίαc Λακαίνηc κύριον, φαύλου χθονόc'·

τὸν δὲ δεύτερον τῆc Μεccήνηc,

'ἀρετὴν ἐχούcηc μεῖζον' ἢ λόγωι φράcαι',

οἵαν καὶ ὁ Τυρταῖοc φράζει. Τὴν δὲ Λακωνικὴν καὶ τὴν Μεccηνίαν ὁρίζειν, αὐτοῦ φήcαντοc,

'Παμιcὸν εἰc θάλαccαν ἐξορμώμενον',

οὐ cυγχωρητέον, ὃc διὰ μέcηc ῥεῖ τῆc Μεccηνίαc, οὐδαμοῦ τῆc νῦν Λακωνικῆc ἁπτόμενοc. Οὐκ εὖ δὲ οὐδ' ὅτι, τῆc Μεccηνίαc ὁμοίωc ἐπιθαλαττιαίαc οὔcηc τῆι Λακωνικῆι, φηcὶν αὐτὴν 'πρόcω ναυτίλοιcιν' εἶναι. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὴν Ἦλιν εὖ διορίζει,

'πρόcω δὲ βάντι ποταμὸν Ἦλιc, ἡ Διὸc
γείτων κάθηται'

This fragment (quoted by Strabo 8, 6 p. 366 C), which describes the beauties of Messenia and the drawing of lots of the Heraclids, has been attributed to the *Kresphontes* by Valckenaer 181 and to its prologue in particular by Musgrave 3, 558. This attribution has been approved of by many scholars (e.g. Welcker 2, 829 f., Wagner 727, Basedow 12 ff., Wecklein 5, Vysoký 11 and 20—all placing it in the prologue); cf. recently Musso[6] 27 f., who adduces several arguments, but none of them substantial: not even the reference to the drawing of lots in the *Cresphontes* of Ennius (fr. LVIII Jocelyn *an inter se sortiunt urbem atque agros*) can prove that fr. 1083 belonged to the *Kresphontes*, because the text as it stands indicates that the drawing of lots took place during the play (cf. Jocelyn 271). This was certainly not the case in Euripides' *Kresphontes*. On the other hand, even if something is wrong with *an* (which Jocelyn 271 regards as a possibility), this

one allusion to the drawing of lots in the *Cresphontes* still does not necessarily imply that the long description in fr. 1083 belongs to the *Kresphontes*. Hartung 2, 42 f. attributed the fragment to *Temenidai*, Nauck placed it among the incerta (although on p. 497 he remarks "probabiliter huc [sc. to the *Kresphontes*] rettulerunt Eur. fr. 908 et 1083") and Webster 138 believed that it belonged to the *Temenos* (for metrical reasons). Now that we have *POxy*. 27, 2455 frs. 9 and 10, which deal with the division of the Peloponnese among the Heraclids and must belong to the hypotheses of *Temenos* and *Temenidai*, there can be little doubt that fr. 1083 must belong to one of these plays. Cf. my article in ZPE 35, 1979, 11 ff. (and especially 13, n. 21).

C. Testimonia

1 *POxy*. 27, 2455 fr. 10 (app. II no. 24 Austin)

C]πάρτην . . . . . ν .[
]μενος δὲ π̣α̣ρ[ὰ] τ̣ῶν[
]το . Τήμενος μερι .[
]φε̣ . · παρ' ἑκόντων τ̣[
Τήμε]νος ἐκλήρωcεν[·] ἔλαχεν [δὲ
Κρεcφόντ]ηc τὴν Μεccηνίαν· τοῖc [δὲ
]παῖcιν †αγαccθενει καὶ ο̣ρ[
] . . η[ ] . . ε̣ν τῶι κλήρωι
]ω̣cενεγ-
]λ̣ιζ[

Omnia suppl. Turner[2] praeter 7 init. Ἀριcτοδήμου Barrett apud Austin 98 et fin. Εὐρυcθένει καὶ Προκλεῖ? Austin (cf. Turner[2] ad loc.).

Musso[5] 64-67 argues that this fragment is from a hypothesis to the *Kresphontes*, because it deals with the division of the Peloponnese among the Heraclids (he compares Ennius fr. LVIII Jocelyn). But it is unlikely that this subject was dealt with so elaborately in the *Kresphontes* (cf. app. 1 B 5) and a title with K would be out of place in *POxy*. 2455 (cf. Turner[2] 32). Turner's arrangement, which connects fr. 8 (containing the title *Temenos*) with fr. 10 (Turner[2] 34 and 59), is much more satisfactory; cf. also Austin 98, who combined fr. 8 and 10 into a hypothesis to *Temenos*, and my article in ZPE 35, 1979, 12 f.

2 Amm. 28, 4, 27 (Clark)

Cumque mutuum illi quid petunt, soccos ut Miconas uidebis et Lachetas: cum adiguntur ut reddant, ita coturnatos et turgidos, ut Heraclidas illos Cresfonten et Temenum putes.

This passage was regarded by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Hermes 11, 1876, 301 f. as an indication that there had been a trilogy *Heracl.-Kresphontes-Temenos* (cf. also intr. 1.3). However, what Ammianus meant to say was probably just "those Heraclids, i.e. Kresphontes and Temenos". Cf. also Goossens 306 n. 169; Musso[6] XXIX (Wilamowitz's idea was accepted by W. N. Bates, *Euripides, a student of human nature*, Philadelphia 1930, 110).

Even so, the passage is of some importance for the *Kresphontes*, because it suggests that Kresphontes Sr. also was a character in some play: (1) *coturnatos* looks like a reference to some tragic performance, (2) the expression *Heraclidas illos Cresfonten et Temenum* suggests a close connection between the two; that is, they are probably the brothers Temenos and Kresphontes Sr., not uncle and nephew. The passage may refer to *Temenos* or *Temenidai* (cf. the summaries in *POxy*. 27, 2455 frs. 9 and 10, which mention the division of the Peloponnese) or perhaps to the *Cresphontes* of Ennius (cf. fr. LVIII Jocelyn).

3 Quint. *Inst.* 11, 3, 73 (Radermacher)

> *Itaque in iis, quae ad scaenam componuntur, fabulis artifices pronuntiandi a personis quoque adfectus mutuantur, ut sit Aërope in tragoedia tristis.*

This passage was regarded as a reference to the *Kresphontes* by e.g. Jahn 227, who reads *Merope* instead of *Aërope* with Lange and wants to connect the passage with fr. 449. But there is no need to change the text as Aerope was a tragic character too; cf. on test. 2.

Appendix 2

FRAGMENTS AND TESTIMONIA ATTRIBUTED TO THE *ARCHELAOS*

A. Papyrus-fragments

1 E. fr. inc. 953 (*PDidot*; for the text see appendix 1 A)

This fragment has been attributed to the *Archelaos* by Th. Kock, RhM 35, 1880, 269ff., who believed that the daughter of Kisseus spoke these lines in protest against her father when he wanted to end the 'engagement' with Archelaos. But see intr. *Kresphontes* 1.4 and appendix 1 A.

2 *TrGF* 2 F* 638 (*PSI* 2, 136)

]ε̣των μεῖζον ἢ φρο[
]ν ἐπὶ τοῦτ' οἰκωμε[
× – ⏑ – × τὴ]ν μόνην παραψυχ[ὴν
]ς̣ γὰρ εἰδείημεν ἄν
παρ]απέτασμα μηχαν[ῆς
]ς ὥς τ' εἰπεῖν ὀκνεῖ[
]ο̣ς ὥς τ' αἰσχύνετ̣[αι
]ν̣ τοῖς θύρασι δεῖ κ̣ .[
] . κακῶς πρα̣σ̣σ̣ο̣ν̣τ̣α̣ος̣[
]ν τις ἄλλοθεν κακῶς̣
θα]υμάσαντ' ἀνιστορεῖ[
κ]α̣ὶ̣ δάμαρτα καὶ τέκνα
]ος̣, ἀλλὰ τἀγάθ' ἡμέρα
]εοι σφάλλει μία·
ὦ] ξέν', ἠδίκηκέ σε
ἐ]χθρός· οἱ δὲ χρώμενοι
] π̣ῆμα κίβδηλος φίλος·
] τις ἠδίκηκέ σε
] . . . ν ἀνθρώπων τινά
]ε̣ς καὶ δοκῶν εἶναι φίλος
]ς̣ε χρώμενος φαύλοις φίλοις

This fragment, which consists of the ends of 21 lines of iambic trimeters (or trochaic tetrameters), was described as "frammento di tragedia" in the *editio princeps* (by G. Vitelli in *PSI* 2, 1913, 58-59), because of its metre and vocabulary (for details see Vitelli's introduction). A problem is presented by 2

]ν ἐπὶ τοῦτ' οἴκωμε[, where an 'anapaest' caused by resolution of the second breve and not in a proper name seems unavoidable (unless there is some corruption): this would be inconceivable in fifth-century tragedy (cf. Maas 67; on 'anapaests' and their possible positions in Euripides' trimeters [opening of line and pre-caesural position] see Dale intr. *Hel.* XXVI). Vitelli tried to solve the difficulty by scanning]ν ἐ|π'ὶ τοῦτ'|, but such an extension of the resolved element over two words only makes things worse (cf. Maas 67). Interpretation of the fragment as trochaic is unattractive for this same reason. Because of this difficulty A. Körte, APF 7, 1924, 119f. preferred to regard the fragment as part of a collection of "Paränetische Iamben". But, although the text seems to contain certain gnomic elements, the addresses in 15 and 18 rather suggest that it is from a dialogue or a rhesis. M. Bestetti - E. Barioli, in *Studi della Scuola Papirologica*, Milano 1915, 72-77 attributed the fragment to comedy, mainly because of its contents, for which they compared Pl. *Merc.* 378ff., *Amph.* 176ff. But this interpretation too is not favoured by the fragment's metre.

Most recently the fragment has been attributed to the *Archelaos* by A. Carlini, in *Actes du XVe Congrès International de Papyrologie* III (Papyrologica Bruxellensia 18), Bruxelles 1979, 86-91 (Plate IV). Carlini redated the papyrus to III B.C. ("II A.D.?" *ed. princeps*) and then argued on grounds of vocabulary that the fragment may well be from Euripides and that the contents fit the *Archelaos*. However, his reasons for attributing the fragment to Euripides are far from cogent: 3 παραψυχ[ὴν (not in A. and S., but twice in E.); 12 δάμαρτα καὶ τέκνα (cf. *Tr.* 392); 17 κίβδηλος (not in A. and S., but several times in E.). All this may be due to accident or imitation and it does not, I think, outweigh the argument against Euripides provided by the anapaest in 2 (which Carlini tries to avoid by accepting Vitelli's scansion). If the contents of the fragment strongly suggested a play of Euripides, one might perhaps explain the anapaest away as a corruption, but the contents are far too general to justify such a proceeding (in fact, they look rather 'poor' and not at all like A., S. or E.). On the whole, the judgment of Kannicht-Snell ad loc. is most likely to be right: "pot. tragoedia sententiosa aetate inferior subsit". Ironically this is supported by Carlini's redating of the papyrus, as such a play would not be very likely to have survived into II A.D.; cf. e.g. D. L. Page, *A new Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge 1951, 37 on the fate of Hellenistic tragedy.

3 *TrGF* 2 F 646 (*PBerol.* 21186)

col. I col. II

. . .

× – ⏑ – × – ⏑ πλ]ọῦτον δ' ἡ τύχη

]τὴν δὲ δόξαν ὁ φθόν̣[ο]c	. . [
] π̣α̣ιδεία μόνη·	. [
] πάντα τὸν χρόνον	α . [
]γοναπορ[.]c	η̣[
]ο̣τητα ν̣ο̣υ̣θ̣ε̣τ̣εῖ	ν . [
] . αγηκότι	κ . [
] . εὐδαιμονεῖ·	μ . [
]ηγεῖται κοcμ̣ίωc	cω[
] . Μακηδόνων παῖδεc	cα[
] . φια λαχόντεc	/ [
κλ]ε̣ι̣νῆc ἔρ̣υμα πάτραc	τ . [
] . . λ̣ηv β[. . .] . [. .] . [. .]ρ̣ιπειδ .	ε̣π̣[
]ερ . . . . . . [ ]αχ . αδιν	. . [
]	. [

(quot versus desint incertum)

This papyrus was first published by H. Maehler, ZPE 4, 1969, 109-112. Maehler suggested that it might be from a play of Euripides (because of a possible overlapping of I 3 with Men. *Mon.* Pap. VIII 2 [p. 12 Jaekel] βέβαιόν ἐcτι κτῆμα παιδε]ία μόνη; for details see Maehler 109 f.) and was led by I 10 Μακηδόνων παῖδεc ('the Macedonians'; cf. LSJ s.v. παῖc I 3 and e.g. *Hec.* 930 παῖδεc Ἑλλάνων of the Greeks) to suppose that it must, in that case, be from one of the plays written in Macedonia (by which he meant *Temenos*, *Temenidai* or *Archelaos*): "sollte das Stück aus dem "Archelaos" stammen, müsste es in den Schluss des Dramas gehören: vgl. Hygin. 219 (Archelaus) profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce oppidumque ex nomine caprae Aegeas constituit. Dann wäre Archelaos Subjekt der Verse I 6-9". Earlier in the play there would probably not be much reason to mention the Macedonians, but Apollo as *deus ex machina* could refer to them. Maehler's idea was mentioned favourably by Matthiessen[2] 32. There are however several objections against this attribution: (1) against attribution to Euripides in general one could argue that (a) I 3 παιδεία is not elsewhere in tragedy attested in the sense here required (Kassel apud Maehler 110 n. 1; but Maehler compares the use of παιδεύω in Euripides and of παιδεία in prose since Democritus), (b) in I 10 Euripides would not have written Μακηδόνων (Maehler 112): we do find Μακηδόνα (Lehmann: Μακεδονα *cod.*) as a proper name of the eponymous hero of the Macedonians in Hes. fr. 7, 2 M-W, but that is probably *metri causa*; it then recurs only in later Greek (from Call. *h.* 4, 167 onwards); cf. Kannicht-Snell on *TrGF* 2 F 646, 10, (c) in the lyrical part (I 9 ff.) η is never replaced by Doric α (Kannicht-Snell intr. to F 646); (2) against attribution to the *Archelaos* in particular it can be objected

that (a) the chorus in the *Archelaos* (which very probably consisted of Thracians; see intr. 2.2) can hardly be considered to have spoken I 10ff.: these lines strongly suggest that the speakers were Macedonians themselves (this was regarded as an important objection already by Maehler 110 [where see for details]; cf. also Kannicht-Snell intr. to F 646), (b) the contents of I 1-4 seem to stress the importance of παιδεία and the uncertainty of πλοῦτος (?) and δόξα: a notion which does not seem to fit in very well with the other fragments of the *Archelaos*, in which nobility and fame are stressed (cf. especially fr. 231, 232, 237, 238, 240, 242, 249), and is therefore not very likely to be found in the speech of the *deus ex machina* at the end of the play, (c) if I 1-8 were the last bit of the speech of the *deus ex machina*, one would not expect a long lyrical passage like I 9ff. to follow (such proceedings cannot be paralleled from any of the preserved plays of Euripides).

B. Book-fragments

1 E. fr. inc. 806

ἀλλ' οὔποτ' αὐτὸϲ ἀμπλακὼν ἄλλον βροτὸν
παραινέϲαιμ' ἂν παιϲὶ προϲθεῖναι κράτη,
πρὶν ἂν κατ' ὅϲϲων τυγχάνηι με καὶ ϲκότοϲ,
εἰ χρὴ διελθεῖν πρὸϲ τέκνων νικώμενον

Attributed by Welcker 2, 707 to the 'secret talk' of Archelaos and Kisseus.

2 E. fr. inc. 850

ἡ γὰρ τυραννὶϲ πάντοθεν τοξεύεται
δεινοῖϲ ἔρωϲιν, ἧϲ φυλακτέον πέρι

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by Welcker 2, 704, who took it to be spoken by the adviser of Kisseus, after fr. 250. In Stob. IV 8, 4 the fragment is preceded by the lemma Εὐριπίδου Ἠλέκτρα, but Hense was probably right in assuming that a quotation from the *Electra* has fallen out between the lemma and fr. 850.

3 E. fr. inc. 911

χρύϲεαι δή μοι πτέρυγεϲ περὶ νώτωι
καὶ τὰ Σειρήνων πτερόεντα πέδιλ' [ἁρμό]ζεται[ι
βάϲομαί τ'εἰϲ αἰθέρα πουλὺν ἀερθεὶϲ
Ζηνὶ ϲυμμείξων (vel προϲμείξων) ὁρμάν

This fragment has been attributed to the *Archelaos* by K. Kuiper, Mnem. N.S. 41, 1913, 242, who inferred from the context in which the fragment is

quoted in Sat. *vit. Eur.* fr. 39 col. XVII 30 ff. (speaker A. regards it as an announcement of Euripides' departure for Macedonia and Archelaos), that the lines were from the *Archelaos* and that the *Archelaos* was written before Euripides' departure from Athens. This was accepted and elaborated on by Q. Cataudella, A & R 20, 1939, 41-46 (who stressed the allegorical nature of the fragment) and considered as a possibility by Mette[5] 89 (*F 321?). But their arguments are far from decisive (cf. G. Arrighetti, *Satiro, Vita di Euripide*, Pisa 1964, 139; Matthiessen[2] 32). It is most likely that Satyrus just took this fragment, which may be from a play written shortly before Euripides' departure (cf. Hunt on *POxy.* 9, 1176, fr. 39 col. XVII 30 ff.), and interpreted it as biographical evidence, though not without a critical note (cf. col. XVIII 17 ff.). M. Delcourt, AC 2, 1933, 285 discusses this passage as a typical example of Satyrus' habit of deriving biographical information from Euripides' own plays.

The fragment has also been attributed to the *Antiope* (cf. Kambitsis 134 f.), an idea which may win some support from its contents (cf. E. Kaiser, MH 21, 1964, 115 f., who shows that the mentioning of the Sirens suggests a context about poetry and music; Kambitsis 135; and on the connection of poets and birds Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2, 20 [p. 332 ff.]) and date (on the date of the *Antiope* see Kambitsis XXXI ff.).

4 E. fr. inc. 956

εὔξηι τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα coι παρεcτάναι

This fragment, preceded by the line καὶ cυμπεcόντων πραγμάτων ἄλλων ποτέ (ci. Grotius from the context of the fragment; cf. Nauck's apparatus), was attributed to the *Archelaos* by Welcker 2, 707 (to the same scene as fr. inc. 806).

5 E. fr. inc. 969

οὐ βούλομαι πλουτοῦντι δωρεῖcθαι πένηc
μή μ' ἄφρονα κρίνηιc ἢ διδοὺc αἰτεῖν δοκῶ

This fragment was attributed to the *Archelaos* by Welcker 2, 700 and 707 (cf. Hartung 2, 560; Wagner 676 f.; Cataudella 45 f.) and this attribution is more or less suggested by the fragment's context in Plu. *De E apud Delphos* 1, 384 d cτιχιδίοιc τιcὶν οὐ φαύλωc ἔχουcιν, ὦ φίλε Cαραπίων, ἐνέτυχον πρώιην, ἃ Δικαίαρχοc (fr. 77 Wehrli) Εὐριπίδην οἴεται πρὸc Ἀρχέλαον εἰπεῖν '...', obviously another example of the Peripatetic method of using passages from poets for biographical purposes (cf. above on fr. inc. 911). This makes attribution of the lines to Euripides likely to be right (cf. Wehrli ad loc.). There are no cogent reasons to attribute the fragment to the *Archelaos*,

but Cataudella's observation that the *Archelaos* would be the obvious play to look for fragments to illustrate the relation Euripides-Archelaos has some plausibility (Cataudella 45 f.) and the theme of riches *versus* poverty was undoubtedly present in the play (cf. fr. 232, 235, 246-249). The attribution was rejected by A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum* 4, Berolini 1841, 707. We have a rather similar statement in Men. *Comp.* 1, 197 f. J (cf. also 1, 195 f. J).

6 E. fr. inc. 1038

ὀργαὶ γὰρ ἀνθρώποιcι cυμφορᾶc ὕπο
δειναί, πλάνοc τε καρδίαι προcίcταται

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by Hense on Stob. III 20, 26 (3, 544, 1 Hense) τοῦ αὐτοῦ '...' (ecl. cum lemm. hab. *S*, om. *M A*; praecedit fr. 258). Hense compared Stob. III 20, 11 (= fr. 257), where both *S M* have the lemma Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι and ibid. 12 (= fr. 259), where *S* has got the lemma τοῦ αὐτοῦ and M^{d} *A* again Εὐριπίδου Ἀρχελάωι; similarly *S* in III 29, 38 (3, 635, 3 Hense) $\overset{υ}{τ}$ $αυ^{τ}$ instead of repeating, like *M A*, the lemma Cοφοκλέουc Λαοκόωντοc. Mette[5] 84 attributes the fragment to the *Archelaos* as F 291, without adducing further arguments. Although nothing can be proved, the attribution may well be right (for similar subject-matter cf. fr. 257-259).

7 E. fr. inc. 1045

μὴ κάμνε πατρίδα cὴν λαβεῖν πειρώμενοc

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by Welcker 2, 707 (same scene as fr. 806).

8 E. fr. inc. 1052

νεανίαc γὰρ ὅcτιc ὢν Ἄρη cτυγῆι,
κόμη μόνον καὶ cάρκεc, ἔργα δ' οὐδαμοῦ.
ὁρᾶιc τὸν εὐτράπεζον ὡc ἡδὺc βίοc
ὅ τ' ὄλβοc ἔξωθέν τίc ἐcτι πραγμάτων·
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔνεcτι cτέφανοc οὐδ' εὐανδρία,
εἰ μή τι καὶ τολμῶcι κινδύνου μέτα·
οἱ γὰρ πόνοι τίκτουcι τὴν εὐανδρίαν,
ἡ δ' εὐλάβεια cκότον ἔχει καθ' Ἑλλάδα,
τὸ διαβιῶναι μόνον ἀεὶ θηρωμένη

Zielinski 236 and Webster 257 suggested that this fragment might be from the *Archelaos*, comparing fr. 245 and 237. I should be reluctant to attribute two fragments which are so similar to the same play, but perhaps we cannot

exclude the possibility that fr. 1052 is an 'embellished'—and interpolated—version of fr. 237, as the verbal resemblance is striking (cf. especially fr. 237, 1 and 3 with fr. 1052, 1 and 7) and both fragments convey the same idea (the elaborate statement in fr. 1052, 2-6 is really the equivalent of fr. 237, 2 and fr. 1052, 8-9 may reflect something which originally followed fr. 237 or it may be another embellishing addition; somewhat similarly Wilamowitz[4] 4, 189, who wished to delete lines 4 and 7-9). Differently Webster 257: "the longer version of 1052 N[2] may be the original". N. Wecklein, Phil. 39, 1880, 411 attributed this fragment to the *Temenos* (see on fr. 1053).

9 E. fr. inc. 1053

μιcῶ δ' ὅταν τις καὶ χθονὸς cτρατηλάτης
μὴ πᾶcι πάντων προcφέρῃ μειλίγματα

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by N. Wecklein, Phil. 39, 1880, 411 in order to provide the *Archelaos* with yet another fragment of which the contents recalled a fragment of the *Temenos* (i.e. fr. 744) in his attempt to prove that the *Archelaos* and *Temenos* had a similar theme.

10 *TrGF* 2, F *193

τιμᾶν Μακεδόνων εἵνεκ' εὐανδρηcίαc

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by Schneidewin III (cf. e.g. Welcker 3, 1597, Hartung 2, 563; Wagner 678).

11 *TrGF* 2, F 454

cφαγὰc δὲ Δαναοῦ παρθένων Λυγκεὺc φυγὼν
Ἄβαντα φύει διάδοχον τυραννίδοc

Attributed to the prologue of the *Archelaos* by Wagner 672; a suggestion which was considered to be attractive, but not cogent, by Van Herwerden[2] 326 + n. 1 and is now ruled out by fr. 2, 3 ff. A. (Yet the fr. may well be from another play of Euripides; cf. Kannicht-Snell ad loc.).

12 Diogenes Sinop. *TrGF* 1, 88 F 4

ἄπολιc ἄοικοc, πατρίδοc ἐcτερημένοc,
πτωχόc, πλανήτηc, βίον ἔχων ἐφήμερον

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by Welcker 2, 705, who regarded it as a description of Archelaos who had arrived as a shepherd, spoken by the adviser of Kisseus. Cf. also Wagner 678.

13 Anaxandridas fr. 63 (2, 161 Kock)

τὸ cυνεχὲc ἔργου παντὸc εὑρίcκει τέλοc

Attributed to the *Archelaos* by Matthiae 9, 93. But in Stob. III 29, 12 (3, 629, 4 Hense) the fragment is preceded by the lemma Ἀναξανδρίδου in *S M A*, and there is no reason to assume that this lemma is wrong or to connect it with the following ecloga (fr. 233 of the *Archelaos*). The attribution was accepted by e.g. Welcker 2, 708; Hartung 2, 562; Wagner 676.

C. Testimonia

1 *POxy*. 27, 2455, fr. 9 (cf. app. II no. 4 Austin)

] ἡμιόνου μονοφθάλ[μου
ὑπέμνηcεν χρηcμοῦ τὸν Τήμ[ε]ν[ον ὃc
ἐκέλευcεν τῆν εἰc Ἄργοc κ[αθό]δου λαβεῖ[ν
α]ὐτοὺc ọ̣[δηγ]ọ̣ν τὸν τρ[ιό]φθαλμον· δι[α-
μερίcα]ντοc δὲ τοῦ Ὀξύλου [τ]ὴν Πελο-
πόννηcον εἰc] μέρη τρία, τ[ὴν μ]ὲν Ἀργεί-
αν . . . .]ε̣ Τ̣ή[με]ν[οc ὁ] πρεc[βύ]τατοc,
τὴν δὲ] Μεccηνίαν ἔ[λα]βεν Κρ[εcφόν-
τηc . . . .] τὴν δ[ὲ] Λακ[ω-
νίαν οἱ Ἀριcτο]δήμ[ου] παῖδεc ἀδικη-
]ι̣αν μετα
π]αίδων ποι-
]ν Ἀρχέλαον

Omnia suppl. Turner[2], praeter 7 (suppl. e.g. Lloyd-Jones apud Austin 12) || 12 ἐπὶ π]αίδων ποι[ήcει Turner[2].

This fragment (which I have here printed as it appears in Austin 12; for a transcript and commentary see Turner[2]) has been regarded as part of the hypothesis to the *Archelaos* by several scholars since Turner's *editio princeps* (e.g. Lloyd-Jones[1] 440 f.; Austin 12 [though with some hesitation], Mette[5] 82). There are, however, strong reasons against this (which I shall merely list here: for details see my article in ZPE 35, 1979, 11 f. + notes): (1) it was based mainly on the occurrence of Ἀρχέλαον in 13, but now that we no longer have reason to assume that Archelaos appeared only in the *Archelaos* (see on app. C 2 below), this can no longer be an argument, (2) the contents of the fragments are against it, (3) ἐπὶ π]αίδων ποι[ήcει is a doubtful supplement and so is therefore the relation with fr. 2, 19 ff. A (other interpretations are conceivable: in 10 a new sentence may begin with ἀδικη- [cf. Turner[2] on 123: "perhaps a high stop after παῖδεc"] and it may well be that this sentence went

on beyond the end of 12, π]αίδων referring to the sons of Aristodemos [who might e.g. have felt the division to be unjust], ποι- being some form [part. or inf.?] of ποιέω. If the sentence was shorter, we could have in π]αίδων ποι- /]ν Ἀρχέλαον some information on Temenos' subsequent treatment of his children [giving Archelaos a special position? cf. app. C 2] or some other statement by which Archelaos was for some reason excepted from the other Temenids, which would fit in nicely with the other evidence of Archelaos' exceptional status. The story of his birth, on the other hand, may have been especially invented for the *Archelaos*, suiting the special purpose of this play), (4) the *Archelaos* would not fit in the alphabetical order of *POxy*. 27, 2455. It is best, therefore, to consider fr. 9 as part of the hypothesis to *Temenos* or *Temenidai*.

2 *PMich*. inv. 1319 (*ed. princeps* E. G. Turner, *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 17 [Antidoron M. David], Lugduni Batavorum 1968, 133-136)

οὗτοι μὲν οὖν βιαcάμενοι τὸν πατέρα
τοῖc Ἡρακλέουc παιcὶν cυνκατελοχίc-
θηcαν. ⟨ἀν⟩αβιβαcάμενοι δὲ τὸ τῶν Πελο-
πоννηcίων cτράτευμα ἐπ' αὐτοὺc διεβί-
βαcαν, ὧν Ὀρέcτου παῖc ⟨Τιcαμενόc⟩. Τήμενοc ⟨δὲ⟩
ὁ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν πρεcβύτατοc ἐκτά⟨τ⟩των τὸ
cτράτευμα τὴν βαcιλείαν ἔφηcεν παρα-
δώcειν τῶι εἰc τὴν μάχην ἀριcτεύcαν-
τι τῶν υἱῶν. τὸ μὲν οὖν κρῖμα τῆc μάχηc
ἐγένετο κατὰ τοὺc Ἡρακλείδαc, ἄριcτοc
δὲ ἐκρίνετο Ἀρχέλαοc ὁ πρεcβύτατοc
...... Τημενιδῶν (?) ......

For the text and the arrangement of the lines (which is different from that in the *editio princeps*) see ZPE 35, 1979, 8. This papyrus, which Turner[6] 134 f. suggested that might derive from a hypothesis to a play, was regarded by Mette[4] 9 and id.[5] 82 as part of a hypothesis to the *Archelaos*. But it is very probably part of a hypothesis to *Temenos* or *Temenidai*, because it appears to overlap with *POxy*. 27, 2455 fr. 107, which must be part of a hypothesis to a play starting with a letter from the latter half of the alphabet (for details see my article in ZPE 35, 1979, 7-14 and W. Luppe, ZPE 49, 1982, 15-19, who suggests [1] a more 'suitable' reading in fr. 107, 1 and [2] that perhaps fr. 57 is also part of this hypothesis). The most important inference from this is that Archelaos can no longer be considered to have appeared in or been especially invented for the *Archelaos only*. See further on this papyrus: W. Luppe, *Der Temenos-Papyrus*, Phil. 122, 1978, 6-13; Luppe[2] 243 f.; J. S. Rusten, *The*

return of the Heracleidae, ZPE 40, 1980, 39-42; id., *Return of the Heracleidae: Addendum*, ZPE 45, 1982, 270.

3 *TrGF* 1 CAT. B 1, 49 ff.

]Αφιδν[
Ἀλκ]μήνη Ἀλέ[ξανδρος
] Εὐρυςθ⟨ε⟩ύς[
] ςτ̣ι̣ς [

In 49 f. of this list, Koehler supplied [Ἀρχέλα/ος Ἀλκ]μήνη (cf. *IG* [*ed. minor*] II/III² 2363; Piraeus, ca. 100 B.C.). This was still accepted by Mette[5] (F 280 b), but rightly left unmentioned by Kannicht-Snell.

NOTE ON THE ABBREVIATIONS

Greek and Latin authors are referred to by means of the abbreviations used in LSJ/*OLD*; titles of periodicals are usually abbreviated according to the system of l'Année Philologique. Books and articles are cited by author's name and page-number only: full references can be found in the bibliography (see below); well-known commentaries, which I have not listed in the bibliography, are referred to by name of author and passage discussed (or page of their introduction). For the apparatus I have followed the same system, but if one author is mentioned twice in the apparatus to one fragment, the page-number is given only the first time; authors' names without page-indications refer to editions of the fragment (mentioned in the bibliography) or its source (generally not mentioned in the bibliography). Private communications are thus indicated (with 'Snell in margine' I refer to marginal notes in Prof. Snell's copy of Austin, which he kindly put at my disposal).

I have used the following abbreviations:

CPG: E. L. a Leutsch - F. G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, Gottingae 1839-51 (Suppl. Hildesheim 1961).
DK: H. Diels - W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin 1952-56.
FGrH: F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923-.
KB: R. Kühner - F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache I*, Hannover 1890-1892.
KG: R. Kühner - B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache II*, Hannover 1898-1904.
LFrGrE: B. Snell (u.a.), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen 1955-.
LSJ: H. G. Liddell - R. Scott - H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1968.
OLD: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1968-1982.
Page *GLP*: D. L. Page, *Greek literary papyri I*, London 1941 (ʳLondon 1970).
PMG: D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
RE: A. Pauly - G. Wissowa u.a., *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart 1893-1978.
Schmid *GGL*: W. Schmid - O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, München 1920-1948.
Schmidt *Syn.*: J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1876-86 (ʳAmsterdam 1967-69).
ThGL: H. Stephanus (et al.), *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, Parisiis 1831-1865.
ThLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Lipsiae 1900-.
TrGF: B. Snell (et al.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1971-.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This 'bibliography' is merely a list of the works which I have cited more than once; but I have also included those books and articles which refer

especially to the *Kresphontes* or *Archelaos*, even if I have quoted them only once or not at all (like Walker[2], whose extraordinary views it seemed wiser to ignore altogether!). On the other hand I have not always included works which are cited more than once in a *single* passage: in such cases I often found it more convenient to give the full reference in the text and refer back to it with author's name l.c. or o.c. with page-number. I have also refrained from including well-known commentaries and editions in the bibliography.

F. Adami, *De poetis scaenicis graecis hymnorum sacrorum imitatoribus*, JKPh Suppl. 26, 1901, 215-262.
A. W. H. Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, Oxford 1960.
H. Ahlers, *Die Vertrautenrolle in der griechischen Tragödie*, Diss. Giessen 1911.
J. T. Allen - G. Italie, *A Concordance to Euripides*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1954.
W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*, Göttingen 1969².
J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique*, Paris 1954.
H. von Arnim, *Supplementum Euripideum*, Bonn 1913.
C. Ausfeld, *De Graecorum precationibus quaestiones*, JKPh Suppl. 28, 1903, 505-547.
C. Austin, *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin 1968.
G. Ballaira, *Euripide, fr. 228 N²*, A & R 14, 1969, 63-65.
J. Barnes, *Euripidis quae extant omnia ...*, Cantabrigiae 1694.
F. Basedow, *Commentationis de Euripidis fabula quae inscribitur ΚΡΕCΦΟΝΤΗC. Particula Prior*, in Fünfzehnter Jahresbericht über die Höhere Bürgerschule zu Eberswalde (Progr. no. 89), Eberswalde 1878, 3-36.
V. di Benedetto, *Euripide: teatro e società*, Torino 1971.
H. Bengl, *Staatstheoretische Probleme im Rahmen der attischen, vornehmlich euripideischen Tragödie*, Diss. München 1929.
P. Bergmann, *Der Atridenmythos in Epos, Lyrik und Drama*, Diss. Erlangen/Nürnberg 1970.
L. Bergson, *L'épithète ornementale dans Eschyle, Sophocle et Euripide*, Lund 1956.
F. Blass, *Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen*, APF 3, 1906, 257-299.
F. H. M. Blaydes, *Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Halis Sax. 1894.
D. Bonneau, *La crue du Nil* 1, Paris 1964.
F. H. Bothe, *Euripidis Fabularum Fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1844.
H. Brandt, *Die Sklaven in den Rollen von Dienern und Vertrauten bei Euripides*, Hildesheim 1973.
W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Tübinger Beitr. 20), Stuttgart 1934.
R. Browning, *Herodotus V 4 and Euripides Cresphontes fr. 449 N*, CR N.S. 11, 1961, 201-202.
C. F. H. Bruchmann, *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur* (Roscher Suppl. 1), Lipsiae 1893.
E. Bruhn, *Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. 8 Bändchen: Anhang zusammengestellt von —*, Berlin 1899.
C. D. Buck - W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, Chicago 1944.
A. W. A. M. Budé, *De hypotheseis der Griekse tragedies en komedies. Een onderzoek naar de hypotheseis van Dicaearchus*, Diss. Nijmegen 1977.
W. Bühler, *Noch einmal zur Verfasserschaft der PHCIC des Pap. Didot*, Hermes 91, 1963, 345-351.
A. P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal*, Oxford 1971.
K. Busche, *Zu den Fragmenten des Euripides*, JKPh 41, 1895, 661-668.
E. W. Bushala, *Recent Critical Work in the Fragments of Euripides*, Diss. Ohio 1954.

A. Calderini, *De Cresphonte Euripideo*, RIL 46, 1913, 561-572.
G. Canonica, *Merope nella storia del teatro greco*, Milano 1893.
R. Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles...* (Texte und Kommentare 7), Berlin/New York 1974.
A. Carlini, *PSI 136 riconsiderato*, in *Actes du XVe Congrès International de Papyrologie* (Papyrologica Bruxellensia 18), Bruxelles 1979, 86-91.
Q. Cataudella, *Intorno al frammento di Euripide 911 N². e all'"Archelao"*, A & R 20, 1939, 41-46.
S. A. Cengarle, *Note sul CRESPHONTES di Euripide*, Dioniso 40, 1966, 63-76.
P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en Grec ancien*, Paris 1933.
C. G. Cobet[1], *Novae lectiones...*, Lugduni Bat. 1858.
C. G. Cobet[2], *Euripides*, Mnem. N.S. 5, 1877, 249-273.
C. G. Cobet[3], *Collectanea critica...*, Lugduni Bat. 1878.
R. A. Coles[1], *New literary and sub-literary Fragments from the Fayum*, ZPE 6, 1970, 247-266.
R. A. Coles[2], *A new Oxyrhynchus Papyrus. The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros* (BICS Suppl. 32), London 1974.
C. Collard, *Supplement to the Allen & Italie Concordance to Euripides*, Groningen 1971.
A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, Cambridge 1968².
A. Dascalakis, *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians*, Thessaloniki 1965.
J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954².
J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique*, Macon 1931.
B. C. Dietrich, *Death, Fate and the Gods*, London 1965.
J. Diggle, *Studies on the text of Euripides*, Oxford 1981.
G. Dindorf, *Poetarum scenicorum Graecorum ... fabulae superstites et perditarum fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1869⁵.
E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1951.
B. E. Donovan, *Euripides Papyri I: Texts from Oxyrhynchus*, New Haven/Toronto 1969.
F. Dornseiff - B. Hansen, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, Berlin 1957 ([r]Chicago 1978 [With an Appendix... by L. Zgusta]).
K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, Oxford 1974.
R. Ellis, *On the Fragments of Sophocles and Euripides*, JPh 4, 1872, 251-271.
D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin 1969.
F. Ferrari, *Su alcuni frammenti di Euripide*, SIFC 50, 1978, 232-235.
J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle...*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1978.
P. Frassinetti, *Sul "Cresfonte" di Ennio*, CCC 2, 1981, 15-23.
H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960-1972.
F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronsbesteigung Philipps II.*, München/Berlin 1930.
R. Girard, *La trilogie chez Euripide*, REG 17, 1904, 149-195.
F. Görschen, *Der Hypsipyleprolog*, Hermes 94, 1966, 297-307.
H. U. Gösswein, *Die Briefe des Euripides* (Beitr. z. klass. Phil. 55), Meisenheim am Glan 1975.
Th. Gomperz, *Hellenika*, Leipzig 1912.
R. Goossens, *Euripide et Athènes*, Bruxelles 1962.
B. P. Grenfell - A. S. Hunt, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3, London 1903, 65-66.
J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford 1980.
B. A. van Groningen, *BACIAEYC. De alleenheerscher op het tragische tooneel der Grieken*, Med. der Ned. Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde N.R. 4, 12, Amsterdam 1941, 475-566.
H. Grotius[1], *Dicta poetarum quae apud Io. Stobaeum exstant ...*, Parisiis 1623.
H. Grotius[2], *Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis Graecis ...*, Parisiis 1626.
G. M. A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides*, London 1941.

W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy: III The fifth-century Enlightenment*, Cambridge 1969.
F. W. Hamdorf, *Griechische Kultpersonifikationen der vorhellenistischen Zeit*, Mainz 1964.
N. G. L. Hammond - G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, Oxford 1979.
M. A. Harder, *A new Identification in POxy. 2455?*, ZPE 35, 1979, 7-14.
I. A. Hartung, *Euripides restitutus...*, Hamburg 1843-44.
C. de Heer, *MAKAP — EYΔAIMΩN — OΛBIOC — EYTYXHC*, Amsterdam 1968.
F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis*, Basel 1945 (r Darmstadt 1972).
J. Hemelrijk, *ΠENIA en ΠΛOYTOC*, Diss. Utrecht 1925.
H. van Herwerden[1], *Exercitationes criticae...*, Hagae Comitum 1862.
H. van Herwerden[2], *Over Archelaos..., hoofdzakelijk in verband met Euripides Archelaos*, Verslagen en Med. der Kon. Academie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde 3, 1, Amsterdam 1884, 287-346.
E. Holzner, *Kritische Studien zu den Bruchstücken des Euripides*, WS 15, 1893, 35-76.
N. C. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides*, Athens 1965.
E. Howald, *Untersuchungen zur Technik der eurip. Tragödien*, Leipzig 1914.
M. Imhof, *Tetrameterszenen in der Tragödie*, MH 13, 1956, 125-143.
O. Jahn, *Merope*, Arch. Zeit. 12, 1854, 225-238.
W. Jens, *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*, München 1971.
E. J. Jory, *"Algebraic" Notation in Dramatic Texts*, BICS 10, 1963, 65-78.
R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur* (Zetemata 18), München 1958.
W. Kastner, *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -oc*, Heidelberg 1967.
L. Kayser, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides*, RhM 7, 1850, 117-129.
W. Klinger, *Tragedja Eurypidesa Archelaos: próba rekonstrukcji* (*Essai d'une reconstitution d'"Archelaüs", tragédie d'Euripide*), BACP 4-6, 1935, 99-103.
Th. Kock, *Veri Similia*, Leipzig 1872-73.
W. J. W. Koster[1], *Traité de métrique Grecque*, Leiden 1966[4].
W. J. W. Koster[2], *De prologo Archelai Euripidis*, Mnem. IV 24, 1971, 88-90.
P. Kretschmer - E. Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen 1944.
W. Krieg, *Der trochaeische Tetrameter bei Euripides*, Phil. 91, 1936, 42-51.
K. Kuiper, *Ad Satyri fragmentum de vita Euripidis adnotationes duae*, Mnem. N.S. 41, 1913, 233-242.
V. Langholf, *Die Gebete bei Euripides und die zeitliche Folge der Tragödien* (Hypomnemata 32), Göttingen 1971.
B. Laum, *Das Alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem*, Paderborn 1928.
J. Lens, *Sobre el Cresfontes de Euripides*, Actas del III Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos 2, Madrid 1968, 253-259.
G. E. Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, in G. E. Lessing, *Werke IV* (ed. H. G. Göpfert), München 1973, 229-720.
H. Lloyd-Jones[1], *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. 27*, Gnomon 35, 1963, 433-455.
H. Lloyd-Jones[2], in G. W. Bond, *Euripides Hypsipyle*, Oxford 1963, 157-160.
H. van Looy, *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides*, Brussel 1964.
J. C. B. Lowe, *The Manuscript Evidence for Changes of Speaker in Aristophanes*, BICS 9, 1962, 27-42.
D. Lowicka, *"Archelaos"—Macedonska tragedia Eurypidesa*, Meander 30, 1975, 263-271.
W. Ludwig, *Sapheneia. Ein Beitrag zur Formkunst im Spätwerk des Euripides*, Diss. Tübingen 1954.
W. Luppe[1], *Der Temenos-Papyrus*, Phil. 122, 1978, 6-13.
W. Luppe[2], *Literarische Texte unter Ausschluss der christlichen. Drama*, APF 27, 1980, 233-250.
W. Luppe[3], *Zu einigen kleinen Bruchstücken der Euripides-Hypotheseis P. Oxy. 2455*, ZPE 49, 1982, 15-21.

S. Luria, *Entstellungen des Klassikertextes bei Stobaios*, RhM 78, 1929, 81-104; 225-248.
P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1962.
M. McDonald, *Terms for Happiness in Euripides* (Hypomnemata 54), Göttingen 1978.
H. Maehler, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, ZPE 4, 1969, 81-122.
C. A. Manning, *A Study of Archaism in Euripides*, New York 1916 (^{r}Roma 1978).
A. Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae et fragmenta*... 9, Lipsiae 1829.
K. Matthiessen[1], *Elektra, Taurische Iphigenie und Helena* (Hypomnemata 4), Göttingen 1964.
K. Matthiessen[2], *Zu den Euripidesfragmenten*, GGA 224, 1972, 25-37.
L. Méridier, *Le prologue dans la tragédie d'Euripide*, Bordeaux 1911.
H. J. Mette[1], *Euripides, Kresphontes*, Hermes 92, 1964, 391-395.
H. J. Mette[2], *Die römische Tragödie und die Neufunde zur griechischen Tragödie*, Lustrum 9, 1964, 5-211.
H. J. Mette[3], *Euripides (insbesondere für die Jahre 1939-1968). Erster Hauptteil: die Bruchstücke*, Lustrum 12, 1967.
H. J. Mette[4], *Euripides 1968-1975. Erster Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke*, Lustrum 17, 1973/1974, 5-26.
H. J. Mette[5], *Euripides (insbesondere für die Jahre 1968-1981). Erster Hauptteil: die Bruchstücke*, Lustrum 23/24, 1981/1982.
A. Momigliano, *La leggenda di Carano, re di Macedonia*, A & R 12, 1931, 203-210.
A. Mueller, *Szenisches zu Euripides' Kresphontes*, BPhW 20, 1900, 187-189.
H. A. J. Munro, *On the Fragments of Euripides*, JPh 10, 1882, 233-252.
S. Musgrave, *Euripidis quae extant omnia*..., Oxonii 1778.
O. Musso[1], *I Γεωργοί di Aristofane e il Cresfonte di Euripide*, SIFC 36, 1964, 80-89.
O. Musso[2], *Eurip. Cresph., POx 2458, col. II v. 24*, RFIC 93, 1965, 267.
O. Musso[3], *Ancora sul prologo del Cresfonte di Euripide*, Aegyptus 45, 1965, 151-156.
O. Musso[4], *Recenti contributi a Eurip., Cresph. POx 2458*, Maia 19, 1967, 62-66.
O. Musso[5], *Per la ricostruzione del "Cresfonte" euripideo*, Dioniso 44, 1970, 64-71.
O. Musso[6], *Euripide, Cresfonte*, Milano 1974.
A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Supplementum continens nova Fragmenta Euripidea et Adespota... adiecit B. Snell*, Hildesheim 1964.
W. Nauhardt, *Das Bild des Herrschers in der griechischen Dichtung*, Berlin 1940.
D. van Nes, *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos*, Groningen 1963.
Wilhelm Nestle[1], *Euripides, der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung*, Stuttgart 1901.
Walter Nestle[2], *Die Struktur des Eingangs in der attischen Tragödie*, Stuttgart 1930 (^{r}Hildesheim 1967).
H.-J. Newiger, *Metapher und Allegorie. Studien zu Aristophanes* (Zetemata 16), München 1957.
B. Niese, *Die ältere Geschichte Messeniens*, Hermes 26, 1891, 1-32.
M. P. Nilsson[1], *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, München 1955-1961^2.
M. P. Nilsson[2], *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in ancient Greece*, Lund 1951 (^{r}New York 1972).
E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig/Berlin 1923 (^{r}Darmstadt 1956).
D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford 1934.
D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* 1, London 1941 (^{r}London 1970).
P. N. Papageorgios, *Κριτικὰ καὶ ἑρμηνευτικὰ εἰς τὰ ἀποσπάσματα τῶν Ἑλλήνων τραγικῶν ποιητῶν*, ἐν Λιψίαι 1880.
M. Papathomopoulos, *Nouveaux fragments d'auteurs anciens* (Σειρά 'Πέλεια' 5), Joannina 1980.
H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus*, Oxford 1967.
H. W. Parke - D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, Oxford 1956.
W. Pötscher, *Zeus Naios und Dione in Dodona*, Mnem. IV 19, 1966, 113-147.
M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie*, Göttingen 1954^2.
R. Porson, *Adversaria* ..., Cantabrigiae 1812.

B. Postl, *Die Bedeutung des Nil in der römischen Literatur, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der wichtigsten griechischen Autoren*, Diss. Wien 1970.
J. U. Powell, *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Third Series*, Oxford 1933.
F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Zetemata 72), München 1979.
P. Rau, *Paratragodia* (Zetemata 45), München 1967.
W. Ridgeway, *Euripides in Macedonia*, CQ 20, 1926, 1-19.
C. Robert[1], *Bild und Lied*, Berlin 1881.
C. Robert[2], *Die griechische Heldensage*, Berlin 1920-1921.
C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands*, Oxford 1956.
E. Rohde, *Psyche*, Tübingen 1925[9-10].
W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig 1884-1937 ([r]Hildesheim 1965).
K. Rosen, *Die Gründung der makedonischen Herrschaft*, Chiron 8, 1978, 1-27.
J. S. Rusten[1], *The Return of the Heracleidae*, ZPE 40, 1980, 39-42.
J. S. Rusten[2], *Return of the Heracleidae: Addendum*, ZPE 45, 1982, 270.
C. J. Ruijgh, *Autour de "τε épique"*, Amsterdam 1971.
B. Schmid, *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen*, Diss. Freiburg 1947.
F. W. Schmidt, *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern*, Berlin 1886-1887,
F. G. Schneidewin, *Coniectanea Critica*, Gottingae 1839.
W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*, Berlin/Leipzig 1921[2].
E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem*, Berolini 1887-1891.
E. R. Schwinge, *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides*, Heidelberg 1968.
E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1939-1950.
G. A. Seeck (u.a.), *Euripides. Sämtliche Tragödien und Fragmente 6 (Fragmente — Der Kyklop — Rhesos)*, München 1981.
E. Siegmann, in *Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* (eingel. von B. Snell), Hamburg 1954, 1-14.
B. Snell[1], *Euripides Alexandros*, Hermes Einzelschriften 5, 1937, 1-69.
B. Snell[2], *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen 1982[4].
F. Solmsen, *Intellectual Experiments of the Greek Enlightenment*, Princeton 1975.
A. Spitzbarth, *Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechischen Tragödie*, Zürich 1946.
J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, Heidelberg 1907 ([r]Hildesheim 1965).
Th. K. Stephanopoulos, *Umgestaltung des Mythos durch Euripides*, Athen 1980.
F. Stoessl[1], *Neues über eine verlorene Tragödie des Euripides*, Lebendige Stadt, Almanach der Stadt Wien 1958, 62-67.
F. Stoessl[2], *Prologos 2: Die Praxis der dramatischen Dichtung*, *RE* XXIII 2, 1959, 2312-2440.
R. Strömberg, *Greek Proverbs*, Göteborg 1954.
O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, Oxford 1977.
S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, Copenhagen 1955-1958.
T. G. Tucker, *On the Fragments of Euripides*, CR 15, 1901, 350-352.
E. G. Turner[1], in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 27, London 1962, 73-81.
E. G. Turner[2], in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 27, London 1962, 32-69.
E. G. Turner[3], *Dramatic Representations in Graeco-Roman Egypt: how long do they continue?*, AC 32, 1963, 120-128.
E. G. Turner[4], *Euripides, Kresphontes. A Note*, Hermes 93, 1965, 256.
E. G. Turner[5], *The Prologue to Euripides' Cresphontes*, Aegyptus 46, 1966, 93.
E. G. Turner[6], *Archelaos*, in Papyrologica Lugduna-Batava 17 (Antidoron M. David), Lugduni Bat. 1968, 133-136.
E. G. Turner[7], *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford 1971.
L. C. Valckenaer, *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*, Lugduni Bat. 1767.
Z. K. Vysoký, *Euripidův Kresfontés*, Strahovská Knihovna 5-6, 1970-1971, 5-21.

J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel 1926-1928².
F. G. Wagner, *Fragmenta Euripidis*..., Vratislaviae 1846.
R. J. Walker¹, *Euripidean Fragments*, London 1920.
R. J. Walker², *The Macedonian Tetralogy of Euripides*, London 1920.
T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London 1967.
N. Wecklein, *Über den Kresphontes des Euripides*, in Festschrift L. Urlichs, Würzburg 1880, 1-23.
F. G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet* (RhM Suppl. 2, 1-3), Bonn 1839-1841.
Th. Wendel, *Die Gesprächsanrede im griechischen Epos und Drama der Blütezeit* (Tübinger Beitr. 6), Stuttgart 1929.
M. L. West, *Tragica VI*, BICS 30, 1983, 63-82.
T. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Phil. Unt. 22), Berlin 1917.
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff¹, *Analecta Euripidea*, Berlin 1875 (ʳHildesheim 1963).
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff², *Euripides Herakles*, Göttingen 1895² (ʳDarmstadt 1981).
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff³, *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921 (ʳDarmstadt 1975).
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff⁴, *Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von den Akademien zu Berlin und Göttingen*, Berlin 1935-1972.
Th. Zielinski, *Tragodumenon libri tres*, Cracoviae 1925.
G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Manchester 1955.

INDEXES

1. *Index of Passages discussed*

Aelianus *VH* 14, 40: 27, 48
Aeschylus
Eu. 560 ff.: 210
Pr. 865 f.: 191
Supp. 554: 105
Agatharchides in Phot. *Bibl.* 444 b 29 ff.: 147, 176 f.
Ammianus 28, 4, 27: 279 f.
Anacreon *PMG* 452: 187
Anaxandridas fr. 63 (2, 161 Kock): 228
Anthologia Palatina 3, 5: 29, 55 f.
Apollodorus
2, 8, 4-6: 28, 53 ff.
2, 8, 5: 133
Archilochus fr. 54, 4 West: 66 f.
Aristophanes *Georgoi* fr. 109 (1, 419 Kock): 3, 102
Bacchylides 3, 61 f.: 260
Delphic Oracle
nr. 225 P-W: 135
226 P-W: 136
Demosthenes 18, 180: 27, 47
Dio Chrysostomus 4, 70-72: 146 f., 175 f.
Diogenes Sinopensis *TrGF* 1, 88 F 4: 287
Diomedes *Art. Gramm.* 3 (1, 488, 20 ff. Keil): 145, 169
Ennius
fr. LIII Joc.: 5 f.
LV Joc.: 6
CLXII Joc.: 6
Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 116: 10
Euripides
El. 32 f.: 16, 51 f.
774 ff.: 16
Hel. 386 ff.: 57
487 f.: 73
HF 31: 73
Hipp. 911: 218
fr. 362, 18-20: 276
364: 223
645: 276 f.
806: 284
846: 180 ff.
850: 284
908: 277
908 a Snell: 277
908 b Snell: 277
911: 284 f.
953: see *PDidot*
956: 285
969: 285 f.
1038: 286
1045: 286
1052: 286 f.
1053: 287
1058: 277
1060: 75
1083: 278 f.
[Euripides] *ep.* 5, 12 ff.: 145, 169
Fr. com. adesp. 1224 (3, 611 Kock): 93
Herodotus
5, 4, 2: 93 f.
8, 137-138: 134 f.
Hieronymus *Ep.* 60, 14: 94
Hyginus
fab. 137 + 184[ex.]: 28, 48 ff.
219: 146, 170 ff.
Isocrates 6, 22-23: 10
Justinus 7, 1, 7 ff.: 135 f.
Nicolaus Damascenus *FGrH* 90 F 31: 10
Papyri
PBerol. 21186 (= *TrGF* 2, F 646): 282 ff.
PDidot: 5 f., 275 f., 281
PFlinders Petrie 1, 9 fr. 1, 5-9: 93
PHamb. 119: 142 f.
PMich. inv. 1319: 128, 133, 289 f.
POxy. 27, 2455 fr. 9: 288 f.
10: 279
11: 128 f.
PSI 2, 136 (= *TrGF* 2, F *638): 281 f.
Pausanias 4, 3, 6-8: 10 f.
Philostratus *VA* 5, 7, 193: 27, 48
Plato
Grg. 471 a-d: 129 f.
Lg. 692 b: 10
Plutarchus *De esu carnium* 2, 5, 998 e: 4, 114 ff.
Quintilianus *Inst.* 11, 3, 73: 280
Satyrus *Vit. Eur.* fr. 39 col. XVII 30 ff.: 285
Schol. Aristophanes *Ra.* 1206 ff.: 180 ff.
Sophocles *Ant.* 944-950: 193
Syncellus 198 a-c: 136
Theognis 619 f.: 210
Thucydides 2, 100, 2: 264 f.
TrGF
1 CAT. B 1, 49 ff.: 290
1 DID. B 11, 8-12: 145, 170
2, F *193: 287
2, F 454: 287
2, F *638: 281 f.
2, F 646: 282 ff.
Vita Euripidis 2: 145, 169

2. *Index of Greek words*

ἄζυξ, 'unmarried': 66 f.
αἰαῖ· φεῦ, rare in tragedy: 91
αἰδὼϲ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖϲι, proverbial: 118 f.
ἀμαθία: 218 f.
ἄμοχθοϲ, corrupted into ἀμόχθητοϲ: 225
ἀνορθόω: 224
ἀντλέω, metaphorical use: 112
ἀξυνεϲία, with moral connotation?: 261
ἆρα, in questions: 225
Ἄργοϲ, the plain of Argos: 199 f.
αὔξημα, not only natural growth: 248 f.
ὁ αὐτόϲ + gen.: 72 f.

βαθύπλουτοϲ: 105

γάρ, answering τί: 212
τὸ ... γενναῖον, instead of ἡ εὐγένεια: 215

Δαναοί, Greeks / inhabitants of Argos: 190
δέ, connecting two qualifications: 198 f.; not in first line of play: 59 f.
δέμαϲ + gen. / adj.: 200
δέρη, 'head and neck' only in certain contexts: 76
δὲ δή τί, position in iambic trimeter: 71
δεύτεροϲ, with gen. comp.: 245
Διώνη, etymology: 203 f.
δόρυ, collective: 228

ἐγκατάγω, of Danae's imprisonment: 194
ἐγγύϲ, of divine presence: 256
εἴ ποτε, in prayers: 87 f.
εἷϲ, reinforced by μόνοϲ: 233
εἰϲ / ἐϲ, inconsistent spelling in papyri: 71
εἰϲ ταὐτὸν ἥκειν: 262
ἐκπέμπω, synonymous with ἐκφέρω: 98
ἐπιχώριοϲ, synonymous with ἐπίδημοϲ: 69 f.
ἔϲωθε, instead of ἔϲωθεν: 234
εὖ, indicating approval: 268 f.
εὐανδρία, pregnant use: 221
εὐϲεβέω, transitive: 251
εὐφημέω, 'to express joy': 97
ἐχρῆν / ἔδει: 95 f.

ἡδέ, use in tragedy: 197

θάλλω, metaphorical use: 210
θεόϲ, of abstractions: 241
θηράω, metaphorical use: 216

Ἰνάχου πόλιν, ambiguous: 188 f.

καλλίχοροϲ: 107 f.
τὸ κάρα / ὁ (ἡ) κρᾶϲ: 226 f.
κρεῖϲϲον / κρείϲϲων, introducing gnomic statement: 228
κτιϲτήρ: 65 f.
κῦμα, metaphorical use: 209

λάμπω, metaphorical use: 214
τὸ λοιπόν, used towards end of play: 235 f.

μακάριοϲ ὅϲτιϲ, in formulas of μακαριϲμόϲ: 258 f.
μάκρα / μακράν: 255 f.
μαρμαίρω, of shining armour: 208 f.
μελάμβροτοϲ: 185
μέλλω, play with two meanings: 100
μηκέτι, 'generic' with participle: 64
μικρόϲ, of children: 69; μικρόϲ / ϲμικρόϲ: 227
μιϲῶ, of strong moral judgment: 241 f.

νεανίαϲ (ἀνήρ): 220
νόμοι, associated with τὰ δίκαια: 248
νύμφευμα, 'bridal chamber': 195
τὰ ... ξυνετά, unusual plural: 254

ὀδουρόϲ: 265
ὀλίγοι, of a select group: 228 f.
ὁμώνυμοϲ: 203
ὄντωϲ: 242
ὁράω, word-play: 256

Πελαϲγιῶται: 189
πενία, as a result of war: 210
πολύβωλοϲ: 208
πολυεπήϲ: 91
πότνα / πότνια: 109
προϲφιλήϲ, in active sense: 63

ῥάιθυμοϲ: 220

ϲταγόνεϲ, 'drops' / 'seed': 196
ϲτάϲιϲ, connected with tyrannis: 109
ϲυγκατακτείνω: 67

τάδε, preparative use: 250
τἄλλα, at end of speech etc.: 91
ταπεινόϲ, in contexts of poverty: 243
τε, epic: 197 ff.
τίκτω, metaphorical use: 221 f.
τιϲ, in commands: 122; in threats: 252
τυραννεύω, used *in malam partem*: 66
τύχαι, destructive: 237 f.; 'success': 216

ὑπό, 'pregnant' use: 99

τὰ φίλτατα, with gen.: 120
ὦ φίλτατε, never said by mortals to gods: 89

χάλκεοϲ, denoting strength: 194 f.
χρυϲόρρυτοϲ: 196

3. *Index of Names and Subjects*

Aeolic metre: 104f.
Aeschines: 47
Aetolia: 51, 60
Aigai: 127, 129; etymology: 135 n.21; foundation: 133ff.
Aipytos: 8f. n.3, 54
anagnorisis: 114; 'anagnorisis-mechanema plays': 14
anapaests: 271; in parodos: 206f.
animals, as guide: 174f.; turning against their masters: 246f.
announcement of one's own death: 52f.; in Orestes-plays: 15
anthologies, in papyri: 26; treatment of fragments in: 214, 224, 229
Apollo, in *Arch.*: 138, 174, 176, 230, 232
Apollodorus: 53f.
appositions in relative clauses: 193
Arcadia: 11 n.4, 51
Archelaos, king of Macedonia: 125; alluded to in fr.260?: 264f.; and Euripides: 125 n.1, 129ff.
Archelaos, character in *Arch.*: 138; eldest son of Temenos: 170; in exile: 170; in *Temenos/Temenidai*: 128f., 176f.; invented by Euripides?: 132f., 289; noble ancestors of: 178, 211f.; poor and noble: 213
Archelaos, prologue: 141f., 177f.
asyndeton: 97
axe: 13

blaming the gods: 253

γ̄, character in *Kresph.*: 12, 22, 61f.
chalcidicum: 53, 115ff.
chariot of Helios: 188
chorus, going off-stage in *Arch.*: 173; in *Arch.*: 138f., 267; in *Kresph.*: 13, 167
civil war: 103
composita abundantia: 227
consolatory motives, οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνῃ: 111; mythological exempla: 112
corruptions, by confusion of letters: 56; in Hyginus: 52; by interpolations: 182; by intrusive glosses: 112f., 117f., 221; 'monotheistic': 251; by tendency towards *simplex ordo*: 217

dactylic metre: 269f.
Danae: 193ff.
daughter of Kisseus: 139, 171, 217, 265f.
death, preferable to slavery: 233f.
deus ex machina: 174, 230
Dike, all-seeing: 256f.; appearing late: 257; invisible: 256; personified: 255
Dion: 127
Dodona: 202f., 204

Eirene, personified: 105
ekkyklema: 115
Eris, personified: 110
etymologies in Euripides: 203f.
Euripides in Macedonia: 125 n.1
Euripides *Temenos / Temenidai*: 6, 127ff., 176f., 279f., 288ff.
Euripides-*Vita*: 125 n.1
eyes, expressing a state of mind: 119f.

faithful servants: 16, 17f., 52f., 138
fathers, taking daughters away from husbands: 6

gen. in -οιο: 185f.
goats: 135f., 174ff.

Herakles: 263f.; ancestor of Archelaos: 129, 171; apotheosis of: 99
heredity: 212f.
Hipponacteus, as a clausula: 104
Homeric reminiscences: 68, 228
Hyginus: 48ff., 116f.; mistakes in: 52
hyperbaton: 217
Hypermestra: 190ff.

indentation, of choral passages in papyri: 90, 236
indication, of antilabe in papyri: 25f.; of choral passages in papyri: 25; of speakers in *POxy.* 27, 2458: 22ff.
instability of human fate: 267
invocation, of dead relatives: 89; of gods in tragedy: 86f.; of Hades: 86

Karanos: 135ff.
Kepheus: 197
killing at rituals in Euripides: 53
Kisseus: 138, 207f.
Kresphontes: 12, 51; name: 51f.; speaker of prologue-rhesis: 38f., 62
Kresphontes Sr.: 47, 50, 59
Kresphontes, comparison of testimonia: 49f.; structure of prologue: 56ff.
Kresphontes-myth: 14; *Nachleben*: 12 + n.5; topicality: 11
Kypselos: 10f., 50f., 54, 70
Kyzikos, temple of Apollonis: 55

lectional signs in papyri, accents: 20, 73, 81, 85f., 235, 238; long-marks: 235
Lynkeus: 191f.

Macedonia: 129 ff.; foundation-myths: 133 ff.
mechanema: 121
Merope: 12, 50; forced to marry Polyphontes: 54; violence of: 14 ff., 55
messenger-speeches: 138
Messenia: 11; and Arcadia: 11 n.4, 54
metaphors: 194 f., 210, 214, 216, 221 f.; maritime: 112, 209
mock reconciliation: 53, 110 f., 120 f.
monologue, initial: 58
mourning: 76
myths, in political propaganda: 130 f.; tragic treatments of: 14

names: 9, 51
Nile, floods of: 184 ff.; representing Egypt: 183
Niobids, killing of: 113 f.; number of: 112
nobility, and riches/poverty: 215; inherited from parents: 212 f.

oblique strokes in margin in papyri: 140
old age: 106 f.
oratio recta, in prologue speeches: 204
Orestes-myth: 8, 14 ff., 17 ff., 50 f., 53

PFayum, blank space: 25 f.; identification: 25
PHamb. 118, columnheight: 141 f.; contents: 142 f.; identification: 140 f.; oblique strokes in margin: 140
POxy. 27, 2458, acting copy: 4, 24; dramatic sigla: 22 ff.; handwriting: 19 f.; height of columns: 21 f.; identification: 19; lectional signs: 20; order of fragments: 20 f., 56 f.; size: 20
parenthesis: 205
parodos, of *Arch*.: 206 f.
parody, of Euripides in comedy: 3, 93, 102, 178, 183
peace: 102
Pella: 126
Penia, personified: 240
peoples/countries called after kings: 189
Perdikkas: 134 ff.
perfect, instead of present: 214
Perseus: 195 ff.
pessimism: 93
pitfall: 172 f.
plural, instead of singular: 111
polar expression: 246
Polyphontes: 12 f., 50, 54, 64, 100; killing of: 53, 56; marrying Merope: 54, 56; name: 9
Porson's Law, in trochaic tetrameters: 232
prayers: 84, 102, 105, 108; imperative in: 108
present, 'genealogical': 200; in oracles: 205; instead of perfect: 210
Proitides: 193
prologue, of *Arch*.: 177 ff.; of *Kresph*.: 56 f.
prologue-rhesis, criticized by Aristophanes: 183; genealogies in: 178; indication of speaker's identity in: 205; repetition of information given in: 62; speaker of: 58 f.
prophecies: 205
prospective subj. instead of ind. fut.: 257
πρόσωπον προτατικόν: 61

recognition, at the last moment: 114; in *Kresph*.: 114 ff.; in Orestes-plays: 14 f.
redundant expression: 70
repetition, of lines: 276; of words: 70
resolutions in iambic trimeters: 4, 126 f., 183
rhetorical questions: 83
riches, implying power: 244; not going with ἀρετή: 217 f.

self-love: 101 f.
senex, in *Kresph*.: 13, 16 ff., 52 f.
skilful speech, mistrust of: 251 f.
Sophists: 120
Stesichorus: 17 f., 18 n.9
stichomythia: 60 ff., 66; typical pattern in: 64 f.
Stobaeus, attributions in: 214, 223, 286
'subordinate exclamatory construction': 96

'tail' on o: 72
tail-pieces, in Euripides: 271
Tales from Euripides: 48
teichoscopy: 208
Teiresias: 177
Telephontes: 52
Temenos: 201 f., 217
Theodektes *Mausolos*: 169
Theseus: 264
topos, animals turning against their master: 246 f.; death away from home: 271; justice leading to fertility: 249; peace producing wealth: 105 f.; plain aglow with arms: 209; the weak being subject to the strong: 266 f.
tragic irony: 64, 68, 254, 257, 269
trilogies, by Euripides: 127 f.
trochaic tetrameters: 230 f.; Porson's Law in: 232
tyranny, 'god-like': 244 f.; opposed to justice: 248
tyrants in Euripides: 50, 62, 66

unintentional crimes: 66

wordplay, with μέλλω: 100; with two forms of a verb: 256
wreaths: 226